# CLASSICAL
# PHILOLOGY

A *Quarterly Journal* devoted to research
in the Languages, Literatures, History,
and Life of Classical Antiquity

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XIV       CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1919       No. 1

---

# CONTENTS FOR VOLUME XIV

## ARTICLES

v

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

## MISCELLANEOUS

## BOOK REVIEWS

(See Index)

# Classical Philology

## WORDS FOR 'BATTLE,' 'WAR,' 'ARMY,' AND 'SOLDIER'

### BY CARL D. BUCK

In the midst of a world at war, even the plodding scholar finds it
difficult to fix his attention upon his own proper field of research,
unless it is upon a part of it which bears some relation to war.   Such
points of contact obtrude themselves upon the historian, economist,
sociologist, psychologist, philosopher, mathematician, chemist, physi-
cist, and in every branch of medical science.   So the philologist,
unable to vie with his colleagues in contributions of practical value,
may ponder innocuously on the history of the words which are on
everyone's lips.

Every change in the instruments and practices of warfare leaves
its mark in language, and many of the new terms pass from one
language to another and become international.   The additions to
vocabulary resulting from the present war bid fair to exceed those of
any preceding period, not excepting that following the invention
of gunpowder.   However, it is not my intention to attempt to gather
this crop before it is ripe, but rather to survey the history of the
words (in the Indo-European languages) for a few of the most
general concepts connected with war, such as are common to all
periods, namely 'battle,' 'war,' 'army,' and 'soldier.'

Such a survey must not be expected to yield important contribu-
tions to philosophic thought on the subject of war, at least in my
hands.   No doubt an untrammeled imagination might readily find

in the history of these words an appropriate text for many a generalization on the causes and conditions of war, on militarism versus pacificism, etc.  One might demonstrate anew the universality of war.  Or, noting the frequent identity of 'army' with 'people,' one might observe that the conception of an army as the 'people in arms' is alike the most primitive and the most recent, contrasted with that of the purely professional army which prevailed in the long interim.  Or again, one might note that 'war' sometimes is derived from 'judicial strife' and hopefully foretell the time when it will revert to that conception and when 'soldier' will mean nothing more than 'policeman,' like the French *gendarme.*

But this survey does illustrate, quite superfluously it is true, the international character of war.  For the chief interest in the study of this particular group of words lies in the extensive wanderings which many of them · exhibit.  Thus Latin has furnished one word for 'army' which in its various forms is now current from the Straits of Gibraltar to the banks of the Ganges (42), and another which is familiar in all Europe (44).  A late Latin word for 'soldier' has spread over nearly all Europe and America, and the special Italian form of it over most of continental Europe and to remote parts of Asia (59).  Germanic has given the word for 'war' to most of the Romance languages and English, though this word is not so used in the Germanic languages themselves (33).  Conversely a Modern German word for 'battle' is of Latin origin, though the corresponding form is not so used in any of the Romance languages (15).

'BATTLE'

1–12. From 'fight, strike,' etc.  A battle is simple an organized fight, and the majority of the usual words for 'battle' are connected with verbs meaning 'fight, strike,' or the like.  That this meaning itself is often secondary, coming from other more specific notions not always determinable, need not disturb our immediate grouping.

1. Skt. *yudh-* 'fight, battle,' from *yudh-* 'to fight.'  The root in this meaning is mainly Indo-Iranian (cf. Avest. *yūiδyeiti* 'fights'), and is most prolific of derivatives in Indic (e.g., *yodha* 'battle' in modern Bengali and Mahratti, *yŏd* 'battle' in Kashmiri).  But it appears also in Homeric ὑσμίνη 'battle,' and probably in various

Celtic proper names, as Old Welsh *Iud-nerth*, *Iud-mael*, etc., and in Old Irish *idnae* 'weapons' (Stokes, *Urkelt. Sprachschatz*, p. 224; Pedersen, *Gram. d. kelt. Sprachen*, I, 65). The cognates in other languages, as Lat. *iubeō*, Lith. *judinu* 'move, shake,' Lett. *jauda* 'might,' etc., show other meanings, which may be combined with 'fight' on the basis of 'be or set in violent motion.'

2. Avest. *pəšana-*, the word for 'battle,' once also *pərət-*, from *pərət-* 'to fight'; OPers. *partara-* 'foe' or possibly 'battle';[1] Skt. *pṛt-* 'battle' and *pṛtanā-* 'battle,' and also used as a collective ('fighting body') of a specific type of army organization. The relationship of Lat. *proelium* (cf. Walde, *Lat. et. Wtb.²*, *s.v.*) is very doubtful.

3. Gk. μάχη, the regular word for 'battle' from Homer to the present day, from μάχομαι 'fight,' of which the further connection is uncertain. For various possible combinations, see Boisacq, *Dict. étym. de la langue grecque*, p. 616.

4. Lat. *pugna* is, as first pointed out by Bréal (*Mém. Soc. Ling.,* IV, 82), a back-formation from *pugnō*, *pugnāre*, which is itself a denominative from *pugnus* 'fist.' The semantic extension of fist fighting to fighting in general was effected in the verb. In late vulgar Latin *pugna* was displaced by the following.

5. The general Romance word for 'battle,' Ital. *battaglia*, Roum. *bătalie*,[2] Span. *batalla*, Port. *batalha*, Fr. *bataille*, whence also Eng. *battle*, is from Lat. *batt(u)ālia*, a sporting term applied to boxing and fencing exercises,[3] and derived from *battuō* 'strike, beat,' occurring mainly as a boxing term. The verb is perhaps of Celtic origin, at any rate related to a group of Celtic words (cf. Walde, *Lat. et. Wtb.²* with references, and Thurneysen in *Thesaurus*), and also to OE.

---

[1] New reading *partaram* (*prtm*) established by Weissbach for former *hamaram* in Naksh-i Rustam a 47. Weissbach, *Keilinschriften der Achaemeniden*, translates *partaram patiyajatā* "hat den kaempfenden (Feind) geschlagen" but notes that the corresponding phrase in the Elamitic and Babylonian versions means "hat Schlachten geliefert." It is possible that the Persian also means "waged battle," though the regular word for 'battle' is *hamarana-* (13).

[2] But Roum. *bătalie* is a modern loan word from the French or Italian, replacing in this sense a Slavic word (23). The inherited Roumanian form *bătaie* means 'blow, beating,' etc.

[3] *Gram. Lat.*, VII, 178: *battualia, quae vulgo battalia dicuntur . . . . exercitiones autem militum vel gladiatorum significat.*

*beadu* 'battle, war' (in poetry only), ON. *bǫð* 'battle,' OHG. *Batu-* in proper names.

6. OE. *gefeoht* 'fight, battle,' the usual prose word,[1] from *feohtan* 'fight' (OHG. *fehtan*, NHG. *fechten*, etc.).   Probably related to Lat. *pectō*, Lith. *peszti* 'pull hair'; cf. the use of Lith. *pesztuvės* and *pesztynės* for 'scuffle, fight.'   Connection with Lat. *pugnus* is less probable (cf. Walde, *Lat. et. Wtb.*², p. 622).

7. NHG. *Schlacht* 'battle,' OHG. *slahta* 'slaughter, fight,' from *slahan* 'smite'; cf. ON. *slag* 'blow, slaughter, fight,' OE. *gesleht*, *gesliht* 'fight, battle,' etc.   As the specific military term, *Schlacht* is modern, Luther still using it mostly in the sense of slaughter.   It is doubtless due to the influence of the German usage that in Danish and Swedish (and not in Icelandic) *slag* is now the regular word for 'battle.'

8. Goth. *waihjō*, which translates μάχη (II Cor. 7:5),[2] and *wigans*(?) in *du wigana*=εἰς πόλεμον (Luke 14:31), ON. *vīg*, OHG. *wīc*, OE. *wīg* (one of the commonest words for 'battle or 'war,' with numerous compounds), all from the root seen in Goth. *weihan* 'fight,' OE. *wigan* 'fight,' OIr. *fichim* 'fight,' Lat. *vincō*, etc.

9. Lith. *muszis* 'battle,' from *muszti* 'strike.'

10. Lett. *kauja* 'battle,' from *kaut* 'smite, kill'; cf. Lith. *kauti* 'smite, fight,' NHG. *hauen*, Eng. *hew*, Lat. *cūdō*, etc.

11. The Slavic words for 'battle,' as ChSl. *bojĭ*, Russ. *boj*, Serbo-Croat. *bôj*, Boh. *boj*, etc., or Boh. *bitva*, Pol. *bitwa*, etc. (cf. Berneker, *Slav. et. Wtb.*, p. 68), are derived from *biti* 'strike.'

12. Russ. *sraženie* 'battle,' from *sražat'*, *srazit'* 'strike down,' ChSl. (*su-*) *raziti* 'strike.'

---

[1] In illustrating the wealth of synonymns in Old English poetry, Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 51, remarks: "For 'battle' or 'fight' we have in *Beowulf* at least twelve synonymns."   The twelve mentioned are: *beadu* (see 5); *guð*, cf. ON. *guðr*, *gunnr* related to θείνω, Skt. *han-* 'smite,' etc.; *hild*; cf. OHG. *hilta* 'battle,' MIr. *cellach* 'war,' probably related to Lith. *kalti* 'smite,' Lat. *clādēs*, etc.; *nīd* (see 20); *geslyht* (see 7); *orleg* (see 33); *wig* (see 8); *gewinn* (see 16); *rœs* 'rush, attack'; *lindplega* 'swordplay.'

Where, however, it has not the military sense.   While there is every probability ꜱnat Goth. *waihjō* and *weihan* were used for μάχη and μάχομαι in the military sense, and also that *harjis* was the word for 'army' (see 41), the passages which would determine this are missing.   The only Gothic word group quotable in distinctively military application is that comprising *gadrauhts* 'soldier,' *drauhtinōn* 'wage war,' etc. (see 55).

13–21. From miscellaneous sources, such as 'meeting,' 'array,' 'field,' 'effort,' 'struggle,' 'action,' 'joy,' 'hate.'

13. OPers. *hamarana-* 'battle,' constantly used in the Behistun inscription, is identical with Skt. *samaraṇa-, samara-* 'meeting,' usually 'hostile meeting, fight,' from *sam-r̥-* 'come together.' Compare the military use of NHG. *Treffen*, Eng. *encounter*, etc.

14. Arm. *ṙazm* 'battle' is borrowed from Pers., Pahl. *razm* 'battle,' belonging with Avest. *rasman-* 'battle array,' from *raz-* 'direct, arrange,' cognate with Lat. *regō*, etc. Compare Lat. *aciēs* 'battle array,' also 'battle.'

15. NHG. *Kampf* 'fight, battle,' in the older periods 'duel,' OE. *camp* 'contest, battle, war,' represent an early Germanic borrowing from Lat. *campus*. It is true that this derivation was mildly questioned by Grimm (*Deutsches Wtb.*) and was positively rejected by Kluge in the earlier editions of his *Etym. Wtb. der deutschen Sprache* (but later restored to favor); and Paul (*Deutsches Wtb.*[2]) still says: "Ableitung aus lat. *campus* ist zweifelhaft." But there is no sufficient ground for skepticism, and certainly most scholars today accept the derivation without question. The connecting link, which Grimm felt was missing, is best seen in the special connotation which came to *campus* from the Roman *Campus Martius*.

Among the Franks the name *Campus Martius*, obviously in imitation of the Roman use (but also associated with the name of the month, and after a change of date to May, also called *Campus Madius*) was given to the annual assembly which was "at once an army, a council, and a legal tribunal" (*Cambridge Mediaeval History*, II, 135). Furthermore, *campus* alone was used of lesser assemblies of military or judicial character and most frequently for a single combat in the arena, especially the trial at arms to determine the guilty party, like the duel described by Gregory of Tours (X, 10), which was ordered by the king (*rex campum deiudicat*) to settle a dispute as to guilt. Numerous other examples of *campus* 'duel,' sometimes expressly glossed by 'duellum' or 'certamen singulare,' are quoted by Du Cange. This is the prevailing meaning of OHG. and MHG. *Kampf*. It is also reflected in the derivatives, as *campio* (campiones 'gladiatores, pugnatores,' glossae Isid.), OHG. *chemphio*, Fr., Eng. *champion*,

and the verb OHG. *chemfan*, whence NHG. *kaempfen*. The broader use of NHG. *Kampf* is then clearly a modern extension.

A similar extension, only much earlier, may be assumed for OE. *camp* in the sense of 'battle,' and likewise for OFr. *champ* (*cans*, *chanz*). For it seems more probable that here too this meaning has come through the medium of the late *campus* 'duel' than that it came more directly from *campus* in the sense of 'battlefield.'

16. OHG. and MHG. *strīt*, the usual word for 'battle' (cf. NHG. *Streitwagen*, etc., otherwise *Streit* now used mainly of verbal strife), also frequently 'war,' cognate with OE. *strīd* 'strife, struggle,' ON. *strīd* 'woe, grief, struggle,' also, by the end of the thirteenth century, 'war,' as in Modern Icelandic.

For the semantic development compare also Welsh *trin* 'labor, trouble, action,' also 'battle' (ultimate root connection with OHG. *strīt* is probable), NHG. *Krieg* (see 31), OE. *gewinn* (see 32), OE. *sacu* 'strife,' especially 'verbal strife' (Goth. *sakjō*, etc.), also 'battle' or 'war.'

17. Words meaning 'action' are often applied specifically to military action, as Eng. *action*, Fr. *action*, Gk. ἔργον (e.g. Xen. *Anab.* vii. 8. 17). Such a use might easily become the dominant one and yield the regular expression for 'battle.' But I have no example of this.

18. ON. *orrosta*, the regular word for 'battle' in the Edda, as is Mod. Icel. *orusta*, is probably to be analyzed as *or-z-osta* and connected with OE. *eornost* 'earnestness,' also sometimes 'battle,' from the root seen in Gk. ὄρνυμι 'stir up, incite,' etc. Cf. Per Persson, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XIX, 271, *Beitr. zur idg. Wortforschung*, pp. 636 ff.

19. Skt. *raṇa-* 'joy' is also a common word for 'battle,' the connecting link being 'joy of battle.'

Compare Gk. ἀυτή 'cry,' specialized to 'battle-cry,' and substantially equivalent to 'battle' in the frequent Homeric phrase ἀϋτή τε πτολεμός τε, and in Pindar's κίνδυνος ὀξείας ἀϋτᾶς.

20. Ir. *cath*, etc. The general Celtic word for 'battle,' lacking only in Breton, is seen in Ir. *cath*, Welsh *cad*, Corn. *caz*, Gall. *Caturīges*, cognate with OE. *Heaþo-*, OHG. *Hadu-* in proper names. Further connection with Skt. *çatru-* 'enemy,' Gk. κότος 'wrath' is probable, in which case the semantic development may well have

been 'hatred, enmity, hostility, fight.'   Cf. OE. *nīđ* 'hatred, spite, enmity' (NHG. *Neid*), also in poetry 'battle' or 'war.'

21. Mod. Pers *jang*, the usual word for 'battle' and 'war' (likewise in Hindustani) is obviously the same as Mod. Turk. *jenk* 'battle, war.'   There is no trace of this word in earlier Iranian, and the borrowing in this case is probably not from Persian but from Turkish, just as some other Turkish military terms have passed into Persian (and Hindustani), as *urdu* 'camp.'[1]

### 'WAR'

War is only a prolonged condition of organized fighting, and the distinction which we make between 'war' and 'battle' is secondary and by no means universal.   Several of the words already mentioned are used for 'war' as well as for 'battle' (cf. 6, 8, 16, 21).   Of the following words for 'war,' some are known to have been used for 'battle' (cf. 22, 23);   some are derivatives of words for 'battle' (cf. 25, 26);   and most of the others are from semantic sources similar to those which have been noted in the case of the words for 'battle.'

22. Gk. πόλεμος 'war' was once simply 'fighting, battle,' as prevailingly in Homer, e.g. *Il.* iii. 134: "now they rest quietly leaning on their shields, and the battle has ceased."   It is connected with πελεμίζω 'shake,' πάλλω 'swing, brandish,' etc.

23. Roum. *războiu* 'war' meant 'battle' in the earlier language, before the introduction of *bătalie* (see 5).   It is a Slavic word, ChSl. *razbojĭ* 'murder, robbery,' a compound of *razŭ-* 'dis-' and the root of *biti* 'strike,' seen in *bojĭ* 'fight' (11).

24. Albanian *l'uftε* 'war' is like Roum. *luptă*, Ital. *lotta*, Fr. *lutte*, from Lat. *lucta* 'wrestling match.'   No doubt the Albanian word was once, and perhaps is sometimes still, used for 'battle,' which is, however, commonly expressed by *niza*, of Turkish origin.

25. Arm. *paterazm* 'war' (also 'battle') is from Pahl. *pătrazm*, a compound (prefix *pati-* with vṛddhi, as in Avest. *păiti-văka-*) of *razm* 'battle' (14).

---

[1] Horn, *Grd. d. iran. Phil.*, II, 7, does not mention *jang* in his list of Turkish loan words in Persian.   My belief in Turkish origin is based on the lack of Iranian connection.   Positive evidence, such as the existence of the word in the remoter languages of the Turkish family, may perhaps be supplied by those to whom more material in this field is accessible.

26. Ir. *cogadh* 'war,' Ir. *cocad* 'battle,' is a compound (prefix *co-* 'con-') of *cath* 'battle' (20).   Manx *caggey* is given as meaning both 'war' and 'battle.'

27. Breton *brezel* 'war' (cf. Corn. *bresel* 'strife') is from the root seen in *bresa* 'bruise,' OIr. *brissim* 'break, smash,' OE. *berstan* 'break, burst.'

28. The general Slavic word for 'war,' ChSl., Russ., Boh., etc. *vojna*, Pol. *wojna*, is from the root seen in Lith. *veju, vyti*, Skt. *vayati*, Avest. *vayeiti*, all meaning 'pursue, chase, drive.'

29. Skt. *samprahāra-* 'war' is from *sam-pra-har-* 'hurl, cast, attack."

30. Skt. *vigraha-* 'separation, discord,' from *vi-grabh-*, is another frequent word for 'war.'

31. NHG. *Krieg* 'war' had the more general meaning 'strife' until about the end of the Middle High German period.   It belongs with *kriegen* 'get,' which formerly meant 'strive' (cf. Paul, *Deutsches Wtb.*).   Danish and Swedish *krig* 'war' are borrowed from German; and Dutch *krijg* owes its present meaning 'war' to the influence of the German usage.

32. OE. *gewinn* 'toil, struggle, strife' (cf. *winnan* 'strive,' Eng. *win*) is also the commonest prose word for 'war,' as *Troiana gewin* 'the Trojan war,' *Punica gewin* 'the Punic wars' in King Alfred's *Orosius*, where it is regularly used to translate *bellum*.

33. Ital., Span., Port. *guerra*, Fr. *guerre*, whence ME. *werre*, Eng. *war*, are borrowed from a Germanic word seen in OHG. *werra* 'confusion, strife' (cf. NHG. *wirren, verwirren*).

34. Dutch *oorlog*, etc.   OHG. *urliugi*, MHG. *urliuge*, the usual word for 'war' until displaced by *Krieg*, also (with different grade of the root syllable) MHG. *urlouge*, MLG. *orloge*, OFris. *orloge*, and Dutch *oorlog*, which in spite of the encroachment of *krijg*, persists as the usual word for 'war,' have been connected with Goth. *liuga* 'marriage,' Ir. *luige* 'oath,' on the basis of a compound meaning 'out of compact, breach of compact.'   Cf. ON. *úfriðr* 'un-peace, war.'   So Torp and Falk, Fick, III⁴, 374, *Norw.-Dan. et. Wtb., s.v.* orlog.   Dan. *orlog* is borrowed from MLG. *orloge* and specialized to 'naval war.'[1]

[1] Span. *armada* 'naval force,' contrasted with army, etc., is only apparently an example of similar specialization (see 44).

OE. *orleg* 'strife, war,' OS. *orlag*, etc., though not formally identical with the preceding, is a similar compound, connected with OE. *lagu* 'law.'

35. Lat. *bellum*, early *duellum*, is of uncertain origin. Cf. Walde, *Lat. et. Wtb.*² with references. The combination with Hom. δαΐ 'in battle,' δήϊος 'hostile,' is perhaps the favorite. But the old derivation from *duo*, though the suffix formation is obscure, is semantically possible. For the objection that the earliest recorded 'sense' is 'war,' not 'duel,'[1] is inconclusive. An extension from 'duel' to 'battle,' such as took place in the historical period in the case of MHG. *Kampf* (see 15), and from 'battle' to 'war,' as in πόλεμος (22), might have been completed in prehistoric times. Or the development might have been 'separation, discord' (cf. NHG. *Zwist* from *zwei*), hence 'war,' as in Skt. *vigraha-* (30).

36. Welsh *rhyfel* 'war' is, to me at least, of unknown derivation. For Lith. *karas*, Lett. *karsch* 'war,' see 41.

### 'ARMY'

37–41. From 'people, multitude,' etc. Many of the words for 'army' mean also, or are cognate with words meaning, 'people, host, band, multitude,' etc. The 'army' was 'the people (in arms),' or 'the (armed) host,' a specialization inherent in the situation in time of war. That the military application is secondary is sometimes plain from the evidence, and in general is the natural and reasonable assumption, unless there is specific evidence to the contrary. This is not to deny, of course, that the movement may at times be in the other direction, as in the case of Eng. *host*, from OFr. *ost*, Low Lat. *hostis* 'army' (43), or just as any word for 'army' may be used figuratively to denote a great number.

37. The words of the Germanic group represented by Eng. *folk*, NHG. *Volk*, while usually meaning 'people,' are also used of an 'armed band' or 'army.' So often ON. *folk*, OHG. *folc*, OE. *folc*, and regularly OE. *gefylce*. The borrowed ChSl. *plŭkŭ* is used in both senses, 'people' and 'armed band,' and the military use prevails in Boh. *pluk*, Russ., Pol. *polk* 'regiment.'

---

[1] The old form *duellum*, preserved through the medium of poets, was revived in mediaeval times, under association with *duo*, in the sense of 'duel.'

Paul (*Deutsches Wtb.*[2]) asserts that Volk "war ursprunglich Bezeichnung einer Kriegerschaar." But the more generally prevailing meaning 'people' even in Germanic, the meaning of the cognate Gk. πλῆθος, Lat. *plēbs, populus,* and their obvious connection with *pel-, plē-* 'fill,' ought to make it sufficiently clear that the meaning 'crowd, multitude, people' is the earlier, and that of 'armed band, army' secondary. If Lat. *populārī* is derived from *populus,* as seems to me most plausible in spite of other suggestions (see Walde, *s.v.*), it would indicate at the most that *populus* was also once employed in the specialized sense of 'folk army,' until later replaced by the 'trained army,' *exercitus.*

38. Mid. Ir. *sluag* 'band, army,' Mod. Ir. *sluagh* 'army, multitude, people,' etc., Welsh *llu* 'throng, host, army,' Corn. *lu* (*luu, llu*) 'multitude, army.' That the more general meaning 'band, throng' is also the earlier is apparent from the compounds Mid. Ir. *teg-lach* 'household,' Welsh, Corn. *tei-lu* 'family,' and the probably cognate ChSl. *sluga* 'servant' (originally a feminine collective 'familia'). Cf. Pedersen, *Gram. der kelt. Sprachen*, I, 84.

Compare also Welsh *byddin* 'band, troup' and, besides *llu,* a common word for 'army,' cognate with Mod. Ir. *buiden* 'band, troup,' Old Breton *bodin* which glosses *manus* in *hic Dolopum manus.*

OE. *werod* 'throng, band' (from *wer* 'man') is also used for 'army,' and occasionally, instead of the usual *here,* glosses *exercitus.*

39. Pahlavi *gund* 'army,' whence were borrowed Arm. *gund* 'army' and Arab. *jund* 'army,' is identical with Mod. Pers. *ghund* 'crowd,' and Kurdish *gūnd, jund* 'village.' Although the meaning 'army' is the one quotable from the earlier time, this may be accidental. There are no certain cognates outside of Iranian (cf. Horn, *Neupers. Etym.*, p. 179; Hübschmann, *Pers. Stud.*, p. 83).

40. Avest. *spāδa-* 'army, host,' OPers. *spāda-* in *Taxma-spāda,* Mod. Pers. *sipāh* 'army,' is probably derived from *spā-*, Skt. *çvā* 'swell,' and meant originally 'crowd, throng.'

41. NHG. *Heer*, etc.—The most widespread group of cognate words for 'army' is that which comprises the general Germanic word—Goth. *harjis,* ON. *herr,* Swed. *här,* Dan. *hær,* OE. *here,* OFris. *here, hiri,* OS. *heri,* MD. *here,* OHG. *hari, heri,* NHG. *Heer*—also

OPers. *kāra-*, the regular word for 'army' in the Old Persian inscriptions, further Lith. *karis, karias* 'army' (now obsolete), OPrus. *kragis*, (read *kargis*, i.e. *karjis;* cf. *carya-woytis* 'Heerschau'), with which belong Lith. *karas* 'war' (*karė* in Russian Lithuanian), and Lett. *karsch* 'war.'

The Germanic words in the older period are used not only for 'army' but also in the sense of 'host, multitude, people,' *e.g.* ON. *Danskr herr* 'Danish people,' etc.   In fact Goth. *harjis* is quotable only in the broader sense, translating once στρατιὰ οὐράνιος 'the heavenly host' (Luke 2:13), and once λεγεών (Luke 8:30), though this may well be accidental, the passages where it would be looked for in the sense of 'army,' e.g. Rev. 9:16; 19:19, being lacking.   OPers. *kāra-* also in several passages means simply 'people,' e.g., Bh. 1. 10 "the people had no knowledge that Smerdis was slain."

In spite of the dominance in this group of the meaning 'army,' the probability is that this is derived from 'multitude, people,' as in the case of the words previously discussed.   But the prevailing view is the opposite.[1]

42–51. From various sources, as 'trained,' 'armed,' or 'attacking' (body), 'enemy,' 'expedition,' 'camp.'

42. Lat. *exercitus* was originally an abstract meaning 'training,' as in 'pro exercitu gymnastico et palaestrico" (Plaut. *Rud.* 21. 7).

[1] In discussions of the Germanic group (Paul, *Deutsches Wtb.*[3], Kluge, *Etym. Wtb.*[8], Falk-Torp in Fick, III[4], and *Norw.-Dan. etym. Wtb.*) it is assumed (1) that the meaning 'army' is more original than 'host, people,' (2) that the Germanic word is a derivative of one meaning 'war,' which (3) is attested by Lith. *karas* 'war,' this again (4) being cognate with ChSl. *kara* 'strife.'   But, to take up these points in reverse order, ChSl. *kara* belongs to an extensive group of words used of verbal strife only, especially 'abuse, insult, mockery,' etc., and probably unrelated to the preceding group.   Cf. Berneker, *Slav. et. Wtb.*, pp. 578 ff., Walde, *Lat. et. Wtb.*[3], *s.v.* carino.   With this eliminated, there is no support for the priority of the meaning 'war.'   Further, the notion of an *o*-stem meaning 'war' and a derivative *io*-stem meaning 'army' works out for the Lith. *karas* and the Germanic forms, but, conversely, OPers. *kāra-* means 'army,' not 'war,' and Lett. *karsch* 'war' is a *io*-stem = Lith. *karias*.   Plainly the difference in meaning has nothing to do with the variation in stem, and it is simply a question of semantic development from 'war' to 'army,' or from 'army' to 'war.'   Analogies may be found for a shift in either direction, but here the probability is certainly that the meaning 'war,' which is found only in Lithuanian and Lettic, is the secondary.   Cf. the occasional use of ON. *folk* in the sense of 'battle' (Cleasby-Vigfusson), and of OE. *here* as 'war, devastation.'

If now the alleged derivation of the group in question from a word meaning 'war' is rejected no specific reason is left for assuming the priority of the meaning 'army' over the broader use 'multitude, people.'

Hence in a concrete and specialized sense 'body of men trained to arms, army.'

Borrowed from the Romans in the Orient, probably in Parthian times, *exercitus* is the source of Arabic ʿ*askar* 'army' (with transposition of *ks* to *sk*, as in *al Iskandar* from Ἀλέξανδρος),[1] and, through the Arabic, of Persian and Hindustani *lashkar*.

In colloquial Latin *exercitus* became obsolete, being displaced by *hostis* (43). But it was taken up again from the learned language (see under 43) and became the usual word for 'army' in Spanish and Portuguese (*ejercito*) and in Italian (*esercito*).[2]

43. Low Lat. *hostis*, OFr. *ost*, Roum. *oaste*, etc. In early mediaeval documents *hostis* occurs very frequently in the sense of 'army,' as *hostem maximum collegit, cum hoste plurimo abiit, hoste commoto Francorum*. See references in Du Cange and the indexes of *Monumenta Historiae Germaniae*, especially, *Script. Rer. Merov.*, II, *Leges*, I, II. Examples are most common in works like the *Fredegar Chronicle* and the *Liber historiae Francorum*, from the period between Gregory of Tours and Charles the Great, when a knowledge of literary Latin was virtually extinct. After the first revival of learning in the ninth century and the restoration of book Latin, the proper *exercitus* reappears, and in the great mass of mediaeval chronicles is the only word used. But *hostis* must have been the general vulgar Latin word for 'army.' For it is reflected not only in OFr. *ost* (whence Eng. *host* 'army' and also 'multitude,' now obsolete in the military sense), OItal. *oste*, Span. *hueste*, Port. *hoste*, all now obsolete, but also in Roum. *oaste*, which is still the regular word for 'army,' and in Albanian *ushtrī* 'army.'

By what stages did *hostis* 'enemy' come to mean 'army'? A transition from 'enemy in arms,' 'hostile army,' to any 'army,' would

---

[1] Cf. Brockelmann, *Grd. d. vergl. Gram. d. semit. Sprachen*, pp. 269 ff. Ignored by Haupt, *AOS*, XXXVI, 417. I am indebted to my colleague, Dr. Sprengling, for calling my attention to the Latin source of the oriental words.

[2] The Italian form (with *es*, not *sc* as in *scempio* from *exemplum*) bears on its face evidence of learned origin. Not so the Spanish-Portuguese form, which Diez seems to have regarded as a genuine survival ("exercitus erhielt sich nur im Südwesten"). But here too the older language has only *hueste* (Port. *hoste*), as my colleague Professor Pietsch assures me, and *ejercito* is certainly of learned origin with *j* for *x* after the analogy of inherited forms, just as in *projimo* beside *proximo* (Hanssen, *Span. Gram.* p. 60).

be one's first thought and is taken for granted by some Romance scholars. But what seems more probably the true explanation was given by Diez. *Etym. Wtb.*, I, 229: "Schon in ältesten Mlatein bedentet *hostis* heer oder kriegsdienst; der begriff konnte sich aus der üblichen redensart ire in hostem, gegen den feind, d.i. zum heere gehen, entfaltet haben." The recruiting regulations of the Franks and the Visigoths abound in phrases like *convenire in hostem, exire in hostem, proficisci in hostem, in hostem bannitus,* etc. Cf. for example, from the capitularia of Charles the Great (*Mon. Germ. Hist., Leges* II, 166): "Quicumque liber homo in hostem bannitus fuerit et venire contempserit, plenum heribannum, id est solidos sexaginta, persolvat," while another (p. 153) reads "De peribanno. . . . . Qui hostem .facere potuit et non fecit, ipsum bannum componate," or from the Leges Visigothum (*Mon. Germ. Hist., Leges* I, 367): "conpulsores exercitus, quando Gotos in hostem exire conpellunt." The phrases containing *in hostem* would bear the translation "go forth against the enemy," "summoned against the enemy," etc., but were actually felt as "go forth on military service," "join the army," "summoned to military service," etc., whence also *hostem facere, hostis bannitus* (OFr. *ost bannie*), *prepositus hostis, in hoste* "on military service," "in the army," etc.

44. Fr. *armée*, Eng. *army*, etc. Starting from *armata classis*, current in early mediaeval chronicles, *armata* alone came to be used for 'naval force,' and also, by extension, for 'land force.' OItal. *armata* is used most frequently of a naval force, e.g. *l'esercito e l'armata* 'army and navy,' but also as an equivalent of *esercito.* Span.-Port. *armada* has only the former sense. Fr. *armée* is not quotable before the fourteenth century, and, while the form is French, its use is probably due to Italian influence (though such influence in military terminology is most conspicuous in the sixteenth century, see 59); otherwise it is strange that in earlier French we find, for example, *armez* 'armed men, soldiers, ' but no trace of the feminine form used substantively for 'armed force.'

Fr. *armée* was used for a time of either a naval or a land force and passed into English in both senses. Eng. *army* (*armee, armie*) was used of an armed expedition by sea (so in the earliest quotable occurrence, Chaucer, *Prol.*, 59) or by land ("made a great army into

Scotland," 1502), and of a naval or land force, the application to a naval force not becoming obsolete for some centuries (see NED). Later, Fr. *armée*, in its present established use, beside being the source of Breton *arme*, passed into many of the European languages, without, however, displacing the native words, e.g., NHG. *Armee*, Russ. *armija* (whence also *armija* in Russian Lithuanian, p. 15, note).

45. Dutch *leger*, cognate with NHG. *Lager*, Eng. *lair*, etc., and meaning 'resting place,' especially 'camp,' came to be used for 'army' in the sixteenth century, and is now the usual word (*heir* from MD. *here* being now obsolete, except in biblical language). Luther sometimes used *Lager* for 'encamped army,' e.g., Num. 10:5 where our King James version also has "the camps that lie on the east parts shall go forward."

In one of the Rhaeto-Roman dialects the regular word for 'army' is (or was) *comp*, from Lat. *campus*. So in the Frankfurt New Testament, based on the version of 1648 by Lucius Gabriel of Ilanz, e.g., Rev. 19:19, *lur comps, sin comp*.

OSpan. *fonsado*, OPort. *fossado* 'army,' also φοσσᾶτον 'camp' and 'army' in Byzantine writers, are from Lat. *fossātum* 'ditch,' whence 'camp protected by a moat.'

46. Gk. στρατόπεδον 'camp' was also used frequently of an army, e.g., Hdt. i. 76, Xen. *Anab.* iv. 4. 9, and even of a naval force, e.g., Thuc. i. 117. Cf. στρατόπεδα ναυτικὰ καὶ πεζικά, Xen. *Hell.* vi. 3. 8. Gk. στρατός the most usual word for 'army' from Homer to the present day, is from the root seen in στορέννυμι Lat. *sternō* etc., and meant first the 'encamped army.'

47. OE. *fierd*, cognate with OSax. *fard*, OHG. *fart*, NHG. *Fahrt*, never means simply 'journey' but rather 'military expedition, campaign,' hence also 'army.' A sentence like *Claudius, se casere, fyrde gelǣdde on Breotone*, "Claudius, the emperor, led an expedition [or army] into Britain" (*Bede's Eccl. Hist.*, I, 3) illustrates the easy transition. In the Chronicles *fierd* is the word regularly employed to designate the English army in contrast to the Danish *here*. But elsewhere *fierd* is freely used without such distinction of native and hostile army. In early Middle English *fērd* appears to be more common than *hēre*, and to have become the usual word, prior to the introduction of *armie*.

Compare early NHG. *Reise* often = 'Kriegszug.' The opposite transition is seen in Gk. ταξείδιον (from τάξις in sense of 'body of soldiers'), frequent in Byzantine writers in the sense of 'military expedition,' but now ταξίδι, simply 'journey,' with verb ταξιδεύω 'travel.'

48. Skt. *senā-*, the regular word for 'army' and Avest. *haēnā-*, OPers. *hainā-*, which are applied only to a hostile army, are identical with Skt. *senā-*, Avest. *haēnā-* 'missile' (cf. also Skt. *sāyaka-* 'missile'). The 'army' was the 'missile' or 'attack.' Compare the following.

49. The general Slavic word for 'army,' ChSl. *vojsko* or *vojska*, Russ. *vojska*, Pol. *wojsko*, Boh. *vojsko*, Serbo-Croat. and Bulg. *vojska*, is from the same root meaning 'pursue,' etc., that is seen in *vojna* 'war' (see 28). Lith. *vaiskas* 'army' is a Polish loan word.[1]

50. Arm. *zor*, OArm. *zaur* 'army' is an Iranian loan word. Cf. Avest. *zāvarə*, Mod. Pers. *zor* 'power, might.' Compare Eng. *force* and *forces* in military application.

51. Lett. *kara-spehks* 'army' is 'war might.'

### 'SOLDIER'

52. 'Soldier' = 'belonging to the army,' derivative (or compound) of a word for 'army.' Skt. *sāinika*, from *senā* (48). Mod. Pers. *sipāhī*, which passed into Hindustani and thence into the other Indian vernaculars (cf. Anglo-Indian *sepoy*), from *sipāh* (40). Mod. Pers. *lashkarī* from *lashkar* (42), OArm. *zaurakan* from *zaur* (50). Gk. στρατιώτης from στρατός, στρατιά (45). Roum. *ostaš* (now obsolete, replaced by *soldat*) from *oaste* (43). Alb. *ushtār*, *ushetār* from *ushtrī* (43). OE. *here-mann*, *here-maecg*, ON. *her-maðr* (Mod. Icel. *her-maður*), *her-mǫgr*, from *here* (41).

53. 'Soldier' = 'armed,' derivative of word for 'arms.' Arm. *zinvor* from *zēn* 'arms, weapons,' which is an Iranian loan word (Avest. *zaēnā-*, Pahl. *zēn*); cf. OFr. *armez*, etc.

54. 'Soldier' = 'warrior' or 'fighter,' derivative from word for 'war' or 'battle' or from the same root. The true Slavic words for

---

[1] The Polish loan words *vaiskas* and *žalniērius* (58) are the usual words for 'army' and 'soldier' in texts from Prussian Lithuania. But our Lithuanian newspapers, which reflect the vocabulary of the Russian Lithuanian dialects (and show hosts of words which are bracketed or omitted in Kurschat's Dictionary) use the Russian *armija* (44) for 'army' and the native *kareivis* (54) for 'soldier.'

'soldier' are derived from *vojna* 'war,' as *vojnik* in Russian, etc.; or from the same root, as ChSl. *voji* (plur.), *vojinŭ* (sing.), Serbo-Croat., Russ. *vojin*, Boh., Serbo-Croat., Russ., *vojak*, Pol. *wojak*. (In Russian and Polish these words are now archaic or poetical, like Eng. *warrior*, having been replaced in ordinary use by *soldat* in Russian, *żolnierz* in Polish, see 58, 59.)

OE. *wiga* 'fighter, warrior' from *wigan* 'fight.' Welsh *cadwar* and OCorn. *cadwur*, which glosses Lat. *miles*, belong with MIr. *cath-fer* 'man of battle, warrior.' Cf. ON. *orrosta-maðr*.

Lett. *kara-wihrs* 'war man,' which is used for 'soldier' in the Lettic New Testament, and Lett. *kareiwis*, Lith. *kareivis*, 'one who goes to war' (cpd. of *karas* 'war' and *eiti* 'go'), the regular word for 'soldier' in Russian Lithuania.

55. Goth. *gadrauhts*, which renders στρατιώτης (cf. also *drauhti-nōn* 'to war,' *drauhtinassus, drauhtiwitōþ* 'warfare') is related to OE. *drygt* 'troop, company, army,' *gedreag* 'crowd,' OHG *truht*, 'troop, band,' Lith. *draugas* 'companion,' *drauge* 'with,' ChSl. *drugŭ* 'friend,' etc., all having in common the notion of 'company, band' or 'one of a company.' Specialization in a military sense is partial in the West Germanic forms, complete in the Gothic.[1] The application of *gadrauhts* to the individual soldier, in place of the collective use, probably started in the plural, just as the plural of OE. *dryht* means '*men.*'

56. Lat. *mīles* is most probably connected with Gk. ὅμιλος 'crowd,' ὁμιλέω 'consort with,' Skt. *mil-* 'meet, assemble,' *mela-* 'meeting, assembly.' One may suppose that the form was used first in the plural, *mīl-it-ēs* "die haufenweise, scharweise marschieren-den" (so Walde, *Lat. et. Wtb.*[2], *s.v.*). But another possibility is that *mīlēs* is a secondary derivative, like *eques* from *equus*, from a stem *\*mīlo* (*\*meilo-* like Skt. *mela-*) which had come to mean 'hostile meeting, battle.' Cf. OPers. *hamarana-*, Germ. *Treffen* (13), and for this particular group, the occasional use of ὁμιλέω in a hostile sense, as ὁμιλέομεν Δαναοῖσιν Hom. *Il.* xi. 523, etc.

---

[1] So that they reacted on *driugan*, which occurs only in the meaning 'wage war.' This belongs with OE. *drēogan* 'perform, practice' and others of a group which covers a different semantic area than the above, though very likely ultimately related. Cf. Wood, *Mod. Phil.*, V, 271 ff.

From Lat. *mīles* are borrowed M.Ir. *mīl* (also *cathmil* 'battle soldier'), and Welsh *milwr* (with *-wr* 'man' as in *cadwr*).

57–59. Eng. *soldier*, Fr. *soldat*, etc. From the time of Constantine the Great the gold coin which was the standard unit was known as a *solidus*.[1] From this came the use of *solidum* or more often *solidata* for *stipendium militum*, the regular pay of soldiers, and of the verb *solidare* 'to pay the soldier's stipend.' Hence the mercenary was called (*miles*) (1) *solidarius* or *solidatarius*, (2) *solidenarius*, or (3) simply *solidatus*.[2]

57. *Solidatarius* is represented by OProv. *soudadier* and by OFr. *soudoier* (also spelled *soldoier, sodoier, saudoier, soldeier*), which is the source of Eng. *soldier*, quotable from 1300 on in the greatest possible variety of spellings (*soudoier, soudier, sauder, souldier*, etc., see NED). Ir. *sáighdiur* 'soldier' is a blend of the Middle English form (cf. especially the spelling *sougeour*) with a Mid.Ir., *saigdeoir* 'archer,' a derivative of *saiget* from Lat. *sagitta*. Bret. *soudard* is from the Old French.

58. *Solidenarius* is represented by OItal. *soldaniere*, OFr. *saudenier*, and especially by MHG. *soldenaere, soldener, soltner* (NHG. *Söldner*), early Danish *soldener*. The German form is the source of Polish *żolnierz*, and this again of Lith. *żalniérius*.

59. *Solidatus* is represented by Ital. *soldato*, Span.-Port. *soldado*. The Italian is the source of Fr. *soldat*, NHG. *Soldat*, which replaced the earlier French and German forms (57, 58); and also, through the medium of French (and in part of German) of Dutch *soldaat*, Dan.-Swed. *soldat*, Lett. *saldats*, Russ. *soldat*, etc. (see 54); and again

---

[1] So named, not because it was of 'solid metal,' as is still often stated, but because it was the basal unit, from *solidus* = *integer*. Cf. Daremberg et Saglio, *Dict. des antiq.*, *s.v.* "cette pièce nouvelle . . . désignée officiellement pour être desormais la base de tous les comptes en or, fut, pour ce motif, qualifiée *aureus solidus*, et bientôt on l'appela par abréviation, *solidus*."

[2] Of the great number of forms occurring in mediaeval Latin texts (see Du Cange) many are doubtless due to varying artificial Latinization of the current vulgar forms. Of those cited above *solidarius* is frequent, *solidatarius* rare. Yet the latter is the proper antecedent of OFr. *soudoier*, OProv. *soudadier*, or, to put it more cautiously, it is, whether artificially constructed or not, of the type of formation represented by these. Hence we are justified in employing it as a caption at least; likewise *solidenarius*, though MHG. *soldenaere* appears to be formed after, and was certainly associated with, forms like *bildenaere*, etc.

through the medium of Russian the word has passed into remote languages of Asia, e.g. Yakut *sollat.*

Fr. *soldat* belongs to that large group of military terms which were borrowed from Italian in the sixteenth century (Nyrop, *Gram.*

### SURVEY OF THE MOST DISTINCTIVE WORDS

|  | 'Battle' | 'War' | 'Army' | 'Soldier' |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sanskrit.......... | *yudh* (1), *raṇa* (19) | *vigraha* (30), *samprahāra*(29) | *senā* (48) | *sāinika* (52) |
| Avestan.......... | *pešana* (2) | ................. | *spāša* (40), *haēnā* (48) | ............... |
| Old Persian....... | *hamarana*(13) | ................. | *kāra* (41), *hainā* (48) | ............... |
| Modern Persian.... | *jang* (21) | *jang* (21) | *lashkar* (42) | *sipāhi* (52) |
| Armenian......... | *r̄azm* (14) | *paterazm* (25) | *zōr* (50) | *zinvor* (53) |
| Albanian.......... | *niza* (24) | *l'ufte* (24) | *ushtri* (43) | *ushtār* (52) |
| Greek............ | *μάχη* (3) | *πόλεμος* (22) | *στρατός* (45) | *στρατιώτης* (52) |
| Latin............ | *pugna* (4) | *bellum* (35) | *exercitus* (42) | *miles* (56) |
| Italian........... | *battaglia* (5) | *guerra* (32) | *esercito* (42) | *soldato* (59) |
| French........... | *bataille* (5) | *guerre* (32) | *armée* (44) | *soldat* (59) |
| Spanish........... | *batalla* (5) | *guerra* (32) | *ejercito* (42) | *soldado* (59) |
| Roumanian....... | *bătalie* (5) | *răsboiu* (23) | *oaste* (43) | *soldat* (59) |
| Irish............ | *cath* (20) | *cogadh* (26) | *sluagh* (38) | *saighdiur* (57) |
| Welsh........... | *cad* (20) | *rhyfel* (36) | *llu* (38) | *milwr* (56) |
| Gothic........... | *waihjō* (8) | *wigans* (8) | *harjis* (41) | *gadrauhts* (55) |
| Old Norse........ | *orrosta* (18) | *strid* (16) | *herr* (41) | *hermadr* (52) |
| Swedish.......... | *slag* (7) | *krig* (31) | *hār* (41) | *soldat* (59) |
| Middle High German........ | *strit* (16) | *urliuge* (34) | *her* (41) | *soldenaere* (58) |
| New High German . | *Schlacht* (7), *Kampf* (15) | *Krieg* (31) | *Heer* (41) | *Soldat* (59) |
| Dutch........... | *slag* (7) | *oorlog* (34) | *leger* (45) | *soldaat* (59) |
| Old English....... | *gefeoht* (6) | *gewinn* (32) | *here* (41), *fierd* (47) | *heremann* (52) |
| New English ...... | *battle* (5) | *war* (33) | *army* (44) | *soldier* (57) |
| Lithuanian........ | *muszis* (9) | *karas, karė* (41) | *vaiskas* (49), *armija* (44) | *žalnièrius* (58), *kareivis* (54) |
| Lettic............ | *kauja* (10) | *karsch* (41) | *karaspekks* (51) | *saldats* (59) |
| Old Church Slavonic | *boji* (11) | *vojna* (28) | *vojsko* (49) | *vojī* (54) |
| Russian.......... | *sraženie* (12) | *vojna* (28) | *vojsko* (49) | *soldat* (59) |
| Serbo-Croatian.... | *boj* (11) | *vojna* (28) | *vojska* (49) | *vojnik* (54) |
| Bohemian......... | *bitva* (11) | *vojna* (28) | *vojsko* (49) | *vojak* (54) |
| Polish........... | *bitwa* (11) | *wojna* (28) | *wojsko* (49) | *žolnierz* (58) |

*hist. de la langue française,* I, 56 ff. lists about 40 such), and which aroused the ire of Henry Estienne in his *Deux dialogues du nouveau langage française italianizé,* published in 1578. As to NHG. *Soldat,* which dates from the sixteenth century, it was once suggested that the form found its way into German through the medium of the Italian and Spanish troups in the low countries. But it is more to

the point to recall that the great sixteenth-century wars between Charles V and Francis I, in which the German, Spanish, French, and Italian troops were engaged, were waged chiefly on Italian soil.

The original meaning 'mercenary soldier' was often lost sight of even in earlier periods, and such restriction, with the derogatory feeling attached to 'mercenary,' was wholly absent from *soldat* when it spread over Europe.   The same is of course true of Eng. *soldier* and all the other modern forms mentioned in 57, 58, except that NHG. *Söldner* was restricted to the older sense of 'mercenary,' after the introduction of *soldat*.

# ΠΑΡΑΓΡΑΦΗ AND ARBITRATION[1]

## By George Miller Calhoun

There is nothing in the orators to indicate that in the time of
Demosthenes διαμαρτυρία was ever employed in actions that were
subject to public arbitration.[2]  But παραγραφή was employed in
many actions which fall within this class, and there are allusions to
παραγραφαί in arbitration cases.   The problems that suggest them-
selves in this connection center around two points, the time at which
the παραγραφή must be filed and its effect upon the handling of the
case.   Did the defendant lose the right to present a special plea when
a case was referred to the arbitrator, or could he still file it with that
official during the progress of the arbitration?   In the event of an
appeal from the arbitrator's decision, could a παραγραφή be filed
while the case was for the second time in the hands of the magistrate
who had originally received the pleadings?   Furthermore, was the
arbitrator empowered to decide upon the merits of the special plea
and give an award, just as he would have done in the original action,
or did the presentation of a παραγραφή, no matter at what stage in
the proceedings, effect the withdrawal of the case from his jurisdic-
tion?   A solution of these problems is important for our under-
standing of arbitration as well as of special pleas, but they have
received scant attention.

Lipsius apparently has given no special thought to these ques-
tions, but he observes that παραγραφή "war vor der Antomosie ein-
zubringen," and evidently believes that the filing of a special plea
terminated the possibility of arbitration, for he says, "Ist eine
Einrede gegen die Klage nicht erfolgt oder zurückgewiesen, so hat
. . . . der Gerichtsvorstand sie an einen öffentlichen Schiedsrichter

---

[1] A continuation of the study of special pleas in Attic law that was begun in
*Class. Phil.* XIII, 169–85.

[2] The only instances of διαμαρτυρία from this period are in διαδικασίαι κλήρου
(*Class. Phil.*, XIII, 174), which were not subject to arbitration, as Bonner has shown
("The Jurisdiction of Athenian Arbitrators," *Class. Phil.*, II, 409 ff.; cf. Lipsius,
*Recht*, pp. 981 f.).

zu verweisen."[1]  His further account of the various steps in the preparation of a case for trial suggests that he regards arbitration and παραγραφή as mutually exclusive.   The earlier discussion by Schoemann, while it does not contain any explicit statement on this point, seems none the less to imply the view that Lipsius later expresses.[2]   Other studies, when they do not proceed upon this same assumption, ignore the problem altogether.

Probably it was customary for a defendant to present his παραγραφή when called on to plead,[3] and it would be a delightfully simple solution of our difficulty if we could assume, with Lipsius, that the filing of a special plea must precede the ἀντωμοσία and that it precluded the possibility of arbitration.   But a case which seems hitherto not to have been studied in this connection stands in the way.   In *Apollodorus* v. *Phormion* the cause comes into court on a παραγραφή, and yet we find unmistakable evidence that it has been heard before a public arbitrator.[4]   This undoubted instance of arbitration and special plea in one and the same case renders the view of Lipsius quite untenable, for one or the other of his assumptions must be abandoned.   Either a παραγραφή could be filed after reference to an arbitrator, or special pleas entered in arbitration cases took the usual course and were decided by the arbitrator.   In this instance, however, we do not know whether the special plea was filed before the reference with the instructing magistrate, or later with the arbitrator, or even after an appeal had been taken.   Consequently it does not prove that an arbitrator could give an award in a παραγραφή.

At this point it may be well to consider a number of passages in which παραγραφή is mentioned in connection with arbitration.   In

---

[1] *Recht*, p. 835; cf. p. 845.

[2] *MSL*, pp. 825 ff., especially p. 833.

[3] *Class. Phil.*, XIII, 170.   The introduction in one instance (Isaeus 5. 16) of a διαμαρτυρία just prior to the ἀντωμοσία does not warrant the sweeping conclusion (*Recht*, p. 835, n. 20) that both διαμαρτυρία and παραγραφή must invariably be filed at this stage.

[4] All circumstances of this case harmonize with the accepted view that the arbitration was public.   There was a single arbitrator (Dem. 36. 18, 33; 45. 23, 58, 10), the sessions were held ἐν τῇ ποικίλῃ στοᾷ (*ibid.* 45. 17), witnesses were sworn (*ibid.* 58), and at the conclusion of the arbitration the documents were sealed in the boxes and kept by the magistrate until the trial (*ibid.* 57–58; cf. *infra*, p. 28).

the speech *Against Midias* Demosthenes says that in his action against
Midias for abusive language the public arbitrator Straton, ἐπειδή
ποθ' ἧκεν ἡ κυρία, πάντα δ' ἤδη διεξεληλύθει ταῦτα τἀκ τῶν νόμων, ὑπω-
μοσίαι καὶ παραγραφαί, καὶ οὐδὲν ἔτ' ἦν ὑπόλοιπον, . . . . κατεδιῄτησεν.[1]
And in the speech *Against Euergus and Mnesibulus* the speaker tells
us that when he and Theophemus had each brought an action for
assault against the other, and the two suits were in the hands of arbi-
trators, ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἀπόφασις ἦν τῆς διαίτης, ὁ μὲν Θεόφημος παρεγράφετο
καὶ ὑπώμνυτο, ἐγὼ δὲ πιστεύων ἐμαυτῷ μηδὲν ἀδικεῖν εἰσῄειν εἰς ὑμᾶς.[2]
Again he tells us that Theophemus got his action before a dicastic
court first οὐ παραγραφομένου ἐμοῦ οὐδ' ὑπομνυμένου.[3]  Here appar-
ently we have evidence that a παραγραφή could be filed with an
arbitrator.

Schoemann, however, developed the view that in these passages
παραγραφή has no connection whatever with the special plea but is
a written application for adjournment, affirmed by an oath (ὑπω-
μοσία).  He further conjectured that this mode of petition for
adjournment was admissible in other forms of procedure as well as
in arbitration.[4]  Substantially the same solution is offered by Lipsius
in *Das attische Recht*, though he distinguishes ὑπωμοσία as an affidavit
for adjournment, distinct from the παραγραφή, and does not suggest
that a παραγραφή of this sort was employed in any proceeding other
than arbitration and ἀνάκρισις.[5]  In addition to the passages quoted
above, Lipsius cites notes of Pollux and the *Lex. Cantabr.* on the μὴ
οὖσα δίκη.  Pollux says ἡ δὲ μὴ οὖσα δίκη οὕτως ὠνομάζετο· ὁπόταν
τις παρὰ διαιτηταῖς παραγραψάμενος καὶ ὑπομοσάμενος νόσον ἢ ἀποδη-
μίαν εἰς τὴν κυρίαν μὴ ἀπαντήσας ἐρήμην ὄφλῃ, ἐξῆν, κτλ.[6]  In the
*Lex. Cantabr.* the following statement is credited to Demetrius of
Phalerum: ἐνίους λέγει τῶν κρινομένων κακοτεχνεῖν τοῖς διώκουσιν
ἀντιλαγχάνοντας τὴν μὴ οὖσαν. . . . . ἐνίους δὲ ἀσθενὲς τὸ δίκαιον

---

[1] Dem. 21. 84.  The context shows clearly that the παραγραφαί, as in the following
case, formed part of the arbitration proceedings.

[2] [Dem.] 47. 45.                          [3] *Ibid.* 39.

[4] Pages 697 f., especially n. 11 (ed. 1824).  Schoemann's conclusions were adopted
without modification by Lipsius in his revision (*MSL*, p. 910, especially n. 412).
Hubert (*De arbitris atticis et privatis et publicis* [Leipzig, 1885], p. 39, n. 2) is inclined
to question the correctness of Schoemann's view but makes no attempt to test it
critically (cf. *infra*, p. 25, n. 1).

[5] Pages 229, 836.                         [6] 8. 60.

ἔχοντας καὶ δεδοικότας τὴν καταδίαιταν χρόνους ἐμβάλλειν καὶ σκήψεις οἵας δοκεῖν εἶναι εὐλόγους, καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον παραγράφεσθαι, εἶτα ὑπόμνυσθαι νόσον ἢ ἀποδημίαν καὶ τελευτῶντας ἐπὶ τὴν κυρίαν τῆς διαίτης ἡμέραν οὐκ ἀπαντῶντας ὅπῃ ἂν δύνωνται ἀντιλαγχάνειν, κτλ.[1]

Schoemann presented no evidence in support of his interpretation other than the quotation of the passages now under discussion. Nor does Lipsius make any attempt to explain his grounds for saying of these παραγραφαί, "Mit der Einrede gegen die Zulässigkeit der Klage hat sie natürlich nichts zu tun,"[2] or for assuming that the word here means "petition for adjournment." Certainly the bare citation of these passages does not constitute any argument for denying to the word its usual and familiar meaning. In the three passages quoted from Demosthenes παραγραφή is merely paired with ὑπωμοσία as one means of delaying the progress of arbitration. There is nothing to prevent our taking it in the usual sense, for it has not been proved that a special plea could not be filed with an arbitrator, nor does the fact that the presentation of a παραγραφή involved delay and might have a purely dilatory intent justify us in explaining it as a petition for adjournment any more in the case of an arbitrator than of any other magistrate.[3] In the statement credited to Demetrius we find merely the enumeration of three dilatory measures, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον παραγράφεσθαι, εἶτα ὑπόμνυσθαι . . . . καὶ τελευτῶντας, κτλ. And in the Pollux note we have nothing more than the familiar pairing of παραγραφή and ὑπωμοσία, with the expansion of the latter term by the addition of νόσον ἢ ἀποδημίαν, and an apparently erroneous connection of the two with the δίκη μὴ οὖσα.[4] In none of

---

[1] S.v. μὴ οὖσα δίκη. Lipsius calls attention to the fact that the sentence which is here omitted is not to be understood as part of the quotation from Demetrius (Recht, p. 229, n. 39). It may be added that the first sentence is obviously an introductory summary, and that the quotation proper begins with ἐνίους δὲ. The text as quoted here contains some necessary corrections by Dobree.

[2] Recht, p. 836, n. 22; MSL, p. 910.

[3] Cf. Dem. 36. 2: τὴν μὲν οὖν παραγραφὴν ἐποιησάμεθα τῆς δίκης, οὐχ ἵν' ἐκκρούοντες χρόνους ἐμποιῶμεν, κτλ.

[4] The wording of the note might seem at first sight to support the view that παραγραψάμενος refers to a petition for adjournment, for it is clear that the filing of a special plea in bar could not have been prerequisite to a μὴ οὖσα δίκη. But it is no more reasonable to hold that a petition for adjournment was prerequisite. The manifest impossibility of such a limitation has led Heffter (pp. 359 f.), Platner (I, 396 f.), Caillemer (Daremberg et Saglio, II, 128), Hubert (op. cit., pp. 48 f.), and

these is there the slightest indication that the writers had in mind
anything else than the ordinary παραγραφή.[1]  No better argument
for this interpretation can be based on the scholia to the Midias
passage, where we find in the first note παραγραφή glossed by ἄλλη
ἀναβολῆς πρόφασις, ἢ τρόπον ἢ πρόσωπον παραγραφομένη ἢ χρόνον,
and in the second the following explanation: πολλάκις γὰρ οἱ ἀντί-
δικοι παρεγράφοντο "οὐ πρὸς διαιτητήν με κρίνεσθαι δεῖ, ἀλλὰ πρὸς
ἄρχοντα ἢ θεσμοθέτην, οὐ σὲ δεῖ κατηγορεῖν ἀλλ' ἕτερον, οὐ νῦν ἀλλ'
αὖθις," καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα.  Here again there is nothing of importance,
for it is clear that the scholiasts bring no new facts to the task of
interpretation, but are merely trying, with but doubtful success, to
adapt to the passage in hand the common notion of παραγραφή.[2]

Lipsius (*MSL*, pp. 973 f.; *Recht*, pp. 960 f.) to maintain against Hudtwalcker (*Ueber
die öffentlichen und Privat-Schiedsrichter in Athen* [Jena, 1812], pp. 112 f.) the necessity
for assuming that it was permitted to bring a μὴ οὖσα δίκη in cases of unavoidable
absence where it had been impossible to file a petition for adjournment in advance.
But in making this assumption we are flatly rejecting the statement of Pollux.
Hubert (*loc. cit.*), it is true, attempts to explain the Pollux note by interpreting
ὑπομοσάμενος of the oath mentioned by Demosthenes (21. 86) as one of the steps in
the institution of a μὴ οὖσα δίκη.  But aside from the fact that this affords no expla-
nation of παραγραψάμενος and involves a rather fanciful distinction between τὴν
δίαιταν ἀντιλαγχάνειν and τὴν μὴ οὖσαν ἀντιλαγχάνειν, it may be noted that ὑπο-
μοσάμενος, if it belongs here at all, refers to a time prior to the default judgment
and cannot be understood of the oath mentioned by Demosthenes.  The true solution
of the difficulty is not far to seek, and it is remarkable that it has escaped notice.
Although the Pollux note and that of the *Lex. Cantabr.* are regarded by Lipsius (*MSL*,
p. 910, n. 412; *Recht*, p. 229, n. 39) as essentially the same, they are in fact concerned
with two entirely different matters.  In the former we have a description of the
μὴ οὖσα δίκη; in the latter there is quoted from Demetrius an account, not of the
μὴ οὖσα δίκη at all, but of the way in which litigants availed themselves of this proceed-
ing to obstruct the progress of litigation.  It is one of three maneuvers that serve
this purpose: first they try special pleas, then affidavits for adjournment, and finally
they absent themselves from the closing session with a view to reopening the whole
proceeding by a μὴ οὖσα δίκη.  It is clear that the presence of the words παραγραψά-
μενος καὶ ὑπομοσάμενος νόσον ἢ ἀποδημίαν in an otherwise simple and direct account of
the μὴ οὖσα δίκη is the result of a careless misreading of the statement of Demetrius.
A glance at Dem. 21. 84 ff. and 39. 37 will make perfectly clear what Demetrius
had in mind.

   [1] The expression οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ καὶ γνωρίμου τίθεται in Harpocration and
Suidas (*s.v.* παραγραφή) suggests that the lexicographers recognized no other technical
meaning for παραγραφή than that with which we are familiar.

   [2] As Lipsius observes (*Recht*, p. 849, n. 11 *fin.*), there is no evidence that a
παραγραφή could be brought on the ground that an action was instituted before the
proper time.  In the opinion of the writer the phrase παραγράφεσθαι χρόνον properly
referred to pleas based on the προθεσμίας νόμος.  The scholiast's explanation is obvi-
ously an awkward attempt to explain the passage in hand.

Until the Schoemann-Lipsius interpretation is supported by some valid argument, and proof is adduced that παραγραφή can have the meaning they would attach to it, we must hold that in these passages the word is employed in its ordinary and usual sense, and that a παραγραφή could be filed with an arbitrator as well as with the instructing magistrate.[1]

The Midias passage yields further information. For if Midias had filed special pleas—or, if the plural be rhetorical, a plea—how does it happen that the award was entered, not in the παραγραφή, but in the original suit?[2] The most reasonable inference is that the special plea, or pleas, of the defendant had been summarily denied, presumably by the arbitrator. It is of course possible that the arbitrator could not himself deny the plea but was obliged to refer it back to the instructing magistrate for decision.[3] Indeed the coupling of ὑπωμοσία with παραγραφή in these places tempts one to see in ὑπωμοσία an affidavit for the adjournment that the reference would necessitate. But such a connection between the two proceedings cannot be demonstrated and clearly was unknown to the lexicographers and scholiasts.[4] Furthermore all accounts of arbitration give distinctly the impression that after the preliminary instruction the magistrate took no further part in an arbitration case until the arbitrator made his formal return. And it is a priori probable that the arbitrator was given authority to deny παραγραφαί of which he judged the intent to be purely dilatory, for, if this were not the case, a suit could have been kept in his court indefinitely by a succession of special pleas. With the right to receive παραγραφαί must have been joined that of denying them.

From the Theophemus case we learn that a παραγραφή could be filed at the conclusion of the arbitration, when the time had come

---

[1] Hubert (op. cit., p. 43) notes that there was a need for special pleas in the court of the arbitrator as well as of other magistrates, but he makes no attempt to examine the problem critically. If it be objected that we have only one instance of arbitration in the παραγραφή cases represented by the extant arguments, attention may be called to the fact that five of the seven speeches are in actions not subject to arbitration.

[2] Dem. 21. 81.

[3] In the next paper of this series there will be presented reasons for believing that Athenian magistrates were empowered to dismiss παραγραφαί summarily.

[4] In the notes quoted above the allusion is clearly to the ordinary ὑπωμοσία, as is shown by νόσον ἢ ἀποδημίαν.

for the award (ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἀπόφασις ἦν τῆς διαίτης).  The form of
expression chosen seems to indicate quite clearly that the plea was
filed, not after the arbitrator had given his award, but when the time
had come for him to do so.[1]  And in general it is unlikely that an
arbitrator would accept a παραγραφή after he had closed the case
and pronounced his award, for there is no evidence that a litigant
had any recourse except appeal when the decision was once made.

This suggests the possibility that a παραγραφή might be filed
with the instructing magistrate when the case was for a second time
in his hands after an award and the taking of an appeal.  However,
this would not only have involved practical complications but would
have been inconsistent with the basic principle of public arbitration,
which assumed that the case was considered by the arbitrator in its
complete and final form and restricted the review on appeal to matters
presented by the arbitrator.[2]  That the rule closing the case should
have been so strictly enforced as to bar the introduction of even a
deposition or an excerpt from the laws and yet should have per-
mitted the filing of a special plea, which would alter the whole status
of the case, is incredible.  We must conclude that the right to file
a παραγραφή terminated at the moment when the arbitrator closed
the case and pronounced his award.

There remains to determine the effect the acceptance of a παρα-
γραφή had upon the proceedings in a case otherwise subject to
arbitration.  Did the arbitrator go on with the consideration and
decision of the special plea as he would have done with the original
action, or did the acceptance of a παραγραφή, no matter at what
stage in the proceedings, effect the withdrawal of the case from his
jurisdiction?  Since the παραγραφή entered by Midias was denied,
and we do not know what course that of Theophemus followed after

---

[1] The sudden shift to the imperfect, after a succession of aorists, is striking.
"When it was time for the award, Theophemus was bringing in a special plea and
making affidavit for adjournment, but I . . . . was ready to bring my case before
you."  Kennedy interprets the situation correctly, though he does not attempt to
keep the effect of the tenses.  The circumstances appear to have been that, when
the time came for an award in the action against Theophemus, the defendant filed a
special plea; he then made affidavit for adjournment in the παραγραφή proceedings.
In the meanwhile his cross-action against the speaker, which was not thus delayed
(cf. 39: οὐ παραγραφομένου ἐμοῦ οὐδ᾽ ὑπομνυμένου), came to a decision, was appealed,
and came first before the dicastery.  See Hubert, op. cit., p. 40.

[2] Ar. Cons. Ath. 53. 3; cf. Lipsius, Recht, p. 231, n. 43.

its acceptance, neither case throws any light upon this question. If a solution is to be found, the attempt must be made to trace the handling of the παραγραφή in *Apollodorus* v. *Phormion*. Should it appear that the participation of the arbitrator was subsequent to the filing of the special plea, we shall have to conclude that παραγραφαί filed in arbitration cases were passed upon by the arbitrator and involved no departure from the ordinary procedure. In order to establish this it will be necessary to show either that the special plea was filed prior to the reference, or that the arbitration was completed and the case came into court on appeal in the usual way.

Since there is no positive proof that the παραγραφή was filed prior to the reference, we may proceed to a consideration of the latter question. If we could accept the view of Schaefer that in this instance the arbitrator made no award but left the case to be decided by a dicastery,[1] we should be tempted to infer that this was a consequence of the παραγραφή, and that a special plea was never passed upon by an arbitrator. But Schaefer's theory will not bear examination. The assumption that a public arbitrator could decline to give an award in a case which had been officially referred to him finds no support in the orators and is absolutely incompatible with the explicit statement of Aristotle that an arbitrator was compelled to complete the arbitration (ἐκδιαιτᾶν) of all suits sent to him by the magistrates, and that the penalty for refusing to acquit himself of this duty was ἀτιμία.[2] That this requirement was strictly enforced is shown by the award which Straton was compelled, very much against his inclination, to pronounce against Midias.[3] Nor have we any ground for assuming that an award could be waived by mutual agreement of the parties to the suit, except in the event of a compromise which took the case entirely out of court.[4] And finally we

---

[1] *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*, III (1858), ii, 164; cf. Sandys, *Select Private Orations of Demosthenes*, II (1910), xxv. The writer has been unable to discover on what grounds Schaefer based his dictum. Possibly the information contained in Aristotle would have influenced his opinion (cf. following note).

[2] *Cons. Ath.* 53. 5; Pollux 8. 126. See Lipsius, *Recht*, p. 226; Pischinger, *De arbitris Atheniensium publicis* (Munich, 1893), pp. 21 ff.

[3] Dem. 21. 84.

[4] In the instance just cited Straton first begs Demosthenes to "hold over" the arbitration (ἐπισχεῖν τὴν δίαιταν), and then to consent to a single day's adjournment, but he does not suggest the possibility of waiving an award.

have conclusive evidence that the arbitration of *Apollodorus* v. *Phormion* was completed and the case brought into court on appeal in the usual way. Apollodorus alleges that one Stephanus, a witness for Phormion, had stolen a deposition from him during the arbitration, when he had left his seat to put a witness on oath. He did not notice its absence until the trial, when he was astounded to find that it was not in the ἐχῖνος and at first supposed that the magistrate had tampered with the box.[1] We see from this that the case was formally closed and the documents were put under seal, a proceeding which is inseparable from the final stage of arbitration. Here then is clear proof that an arbitrator was empowered to pass upon questions of admissibility, and that the filing of a παραγραφή in cases subject to arbitration entailed no departure from the usual procedure.

In a problem of such intricacy, where the available evidence is so slight, any attempt at solution must be ventured with diffidence. But it would seem that the difficulties presented by the cases under consideration are met if we conclude that a παραγραφή could be filed with an arbitrator at any time prior to the award; that the arbitrator was empowered to deny summarily any παραγραφή that was obviously evasive; that a παραγραφή, whether filed with the instructing magistrate prior to the reference or later with the arbitrator, followed the usual course of arbitration.

University of California

[1] Dem. 45. 57–58.

# ON THE USE BY ALDUS OF HIS MANUSCRIPTS OF PLINY'S *LETTERS*

By Elmer Truesdell Merrill

In the *Praefatio* (p. xxxvii) to his critical edition of the works of the younger Pliny, published in 1870, Heinrich Keil indicated a somewhat severe judgment of the way in which Aldus, in his text of the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan (1508), evidently treated his sole manuscript authority for that book of the *Letters* ("nam ea quae aliter in Aldina editione atque in illis [*sc.* Auantii, Beroaldi, Catanaei] exhibentur ita comparata sunt omnia, ut coniectura potius inuenta quam e codice profecta esse existimanda sunt. et plurima quidem in prauis et temerariis interpolationibus uersantur," etc.). His conclusion was that even in the part of the tenth book for which our knowledge depended on Aldus alone (x. 1–40) we must believe that he followed his manuscript source (the later vanished Parisinus) much less conscientiously than Auantius had done in that part which he had printed in 1502.

Keil's judgment was of course formed without any knowledge of the actual text of Parisinus other than the few citations of it in certain of the works of Guillaume Budé. But it was a substantially accurate judgment. It might safely have been extended to cover the work of Aldus on the entire body of the *Letters*. Yet some persons, misled, as I think, by the forensic expressions of praise lavished by Aldus upon the manuscript brought him by his exalted patron, Aloisio Mocenigo, have believed Keil's judgment to be unjust, and have been themselves inclined to think that Aldus must have followed his cherished Parisinus in very many, if not in all, of the readings wherein he differed from the other manuscripts known to him and to us. The question, therefore, perhaps needs further treatment; and we are fortunate in having pertinent material accessible that was unknown to Keil.

In that Bodleian volume of Pliny's *Letters* which in an early year of this journal (*Classical Philology*, II [1907], 129–56) I demonstrated

to be the desk-copy of Guillaume Budé himself, are contained, not
merely several hundred scattered readings from Parisinus, but also
a complete transcript of a single letter (ix. 16) and of two much longer
passages (viii. 8. 3 *quas obuias*—18.11 *amplissimos hortos;* x. 4–40).
In these three passages Aldus had Parisinus as his sole possible
authority.   If the passages are long enough to permit the establish-
ment of a reasonable case (and two of them certainly are), it must be
possible to judge from the comparison of their text with that of Aldus
how he was disposed to conduct himself in the treatment of his
manuscripts; and the conclusion will not depend, as that of Keil
necessarily did, on any native or acquired acuteness of critical
perception.   The wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.
And if it should appear from the examination of these passages that
Aldus did not hesitate to forsake the safe following herein of his
much-lauded Parisinus in favor of unnecessary, if not impossible,
conjectures of his own, it will be certainly evident that in the other
parts of the *Letters* no value other than that of conjectural emendation
is to be attributed to his otherwise unsupported readings.   Some of
them may have come from Parisinus; but it would be unreasonable
and unsafe to suppose that any given one was so derived—unless,
indeed, its character is such as to make it very improbable that
conjecture could have been responsible for it.

      To the examination of these three transcripts from Parisinus I
now proceed.   The single letter (ix. 16) is very short and is written
out by the hand of Budé himself on the appropriate margin of the
printed text of Beroaldus (1498), which forms the first part of the
Bodleian volume.   It contains no indications of value for the present
discussion and may be dismissed.

      The second of the three passages (viii. 8. 3 *quas obuias*—18. 11
*amplissimos hortos*) is copied in apparently a professional scribe's
hand (I) on extra sheets of paper, which are inserted in the Beroaldus
text at the proper place.   In order to fill up the last of these additional
leaves, the copy has been continued beyond the end of the great
lacuna in the printed text, and thus parallels the print from viii. 18. 11
*eodem quo emerat* through 20. 1 *transmittere mare;* but this part of
the transcript is not considered here.   Occasionally throughout the
manuscript Budé with his own hand (i) has corrected, doubtless on

the authority of Parisinus itself, an error by his professional transcriber. In a few instances I think he has substituted for the true copy of I a conjecture of his own. Since the later discovered codex M, which was certainly unknown to Aldus as to Budé, gives the complete text of this passage, I have included its testimony in cases where it agrees with I or with i.

In my article before referred to I gave (pp. 144 f.) a list of all the forty-seven cases in which, within the limits of this single transcript, the text of Aldus differs from that of Ii, that is (barring uncorrected errors of the scribe or conjectures of Budé himself), from Parisinus. But in that list I was not concerned to distinguish correct from incorrect readings in the case of either text. In the list that follows I cite the (of course fewer) examples wherein Aldus abandons indubitably satisfactory readings of his only and much belauded manuscript in favor of conjectures of his own. References are by page and line to Keil's critical edition of 1870; the reading of Parisinus (sometimes with mention of M's support) precedes the bracket, that of Aldus follows it:

217.28  secedere M] sedere
218.12  foecunditas (fe- M)M] facunditas
219.14  referendae M] referenda
219.17  solo] soleo
219.20  materiae M] materia
220.3   pars M] par
220.9   ignorantiam M] ignorationem
221.11  quo (corr. I ex quod) M] quod
221.12  semper fuit M] superfuit
222.14  periment (corr. I ex perimerent)] prement
223.20  debuerim quem ad modum M] debuerim an abstinere quemadmodum
224.8   possint aut necessario M] possint quae si scabrae bibulaeue sint aut
            non scribendum aut necessario
225.7   inumbratur fregit (umbratur fregit M)] inumbratur et fregit
225.10  uiderunt quos M] uiderunt hi quos
225.11  deprehendit M] non deprehendit
225.15  illa quidem M] illa quidem loca
225.33  magis inexspectata (magis exspectata M)] magis quoniam inexspec-
            tata
226.3   qui de patre M] qui de illo uti de patre
        quasi de orbo querantur (quaer- M) M] quasi orbi quaerantur
226.5   decipi (corr. I ex decipit)] decipere

226.6   temporum est **M**] temporum prudentia est
226.10  conditione filiam **M**] conditione ut filiam
        instituerat **M**] institueret
227.5   digitos se seruorum **M**] digitos seruorum
227.9   omnes fabulae tullus **M**] uenales tabulae Tulli

Here is a rather long list of unnecessary, and in some instances
particularly flagrant, desertions of Parisinus within a comparatively
short portion of text.   What must have been the case elsewhere?
If no further actual evidence were at command, I should hold that
this alone was sufficient to prove that Aldus must not be trusted as
a loyal, or even a judicious, follower of Parisinus in any place where
he presents us, as he often enough does, with unsupported readings.

But we are not left to this one piece of testimony only, which
might be held to be, by some inscrutable decree of chance, especially
unfavorable to the defendant.   Let us turn to the first part of the
correspondence with Trajan.   Here again in the Bodleian volume the
first forty letters of Book x (as there should be no objection to calling
it) were transcribed from Parisinus by the same clerical hand that
made the transcript to complete Book viii, and were prefixed to the
printed text of Auantius (1502), which gave only letters 41–121
(27–73, according to the numbering of Auantius, which was doubtless
that of Parisinus).   Throughout the transcript, as in that from Book
viii, Budé with his own hand made some corrections in the way of
revision or (apparently much less frequently) of conjectural emenda-
tion.   The first leaf of the transcript was early excised, thus causing
the loss of letters 1–3B.   Those that remain are numbered from
4 to 26, thus according with the scheme of numbering in the text of
Auantius.   In the appended list of readings references are by page
and line to Keil's edition of 1870, the reading of Parisinus (that is,
of **I** or i) preceding the bracket, that of Aldus following it:

271.4   nam fundos] nam et fundos
272.5   esse eum (*corr.* i *ex* et si eum **I**)] eum scilicet
272.34  septembribus] Septembris
274.31  maxime] Maxime
275.2   cum] ut
276.7   agantur] aguntur
276.8   cum maxime] cum Maximo
276.13  et] ut

276.21  sufficienter] sufficientes
276.33  regerere] regere
277.10  paucissimos] paucissimos milites
278.28  dabitque] dabit ipse
279.29  sacramentum ita nondum] sacramento militar i nondum
280.26  reliqui] relinqui
281.11  solent et ad] solent enim eius modi ad
282.21  imperfectus adhuc emissus (emissus *corr.* i *in cont. ex* emissum I,
          *nota·/. in cont. et in marg. sine alio apposita*) destructus etiam est]
          imperfectus adhuc relictus ac etiam destructus est
284.7   conferent] conferunt
284.27  et] est quae
284.28  habet] habeat

This comparative list of readings exhibits the same characteristics as that given from Book viii, and what I have remarked there applies also here.

In order to spare the overburdened pages of this journal, and perhaps the patience of the reader, I omit the examination in similar fashion of the more than five hundred scattered readings from Parisinus contained also in the Bodleian volume. They are really not needed, even to make assurance double sure.

It should be noted that, after all, the question essential to the present discussion is not whether Aldus has not correctly divined the true words of Pliny in all his emendations; the question is whether Aldus is likely to be emending, or is following the to us unknown text of Parisinus, in the many places throughout the rest of the *Letters* where we cannot check his action. The reader may, if he choose, accept the text of Aldus in every detail as the *ipsissima uerba* of Pliny; but he should recognize the only principle on which he can accept it: it must be as a brilliantly emended text, and not at all as one founded securely upon the following of Parisinus, or of any other manuscript source, whenever it departs from our extant manuscript traditions.

My own judgment of course goes much farther than this. To my mind, as I venture to believe to that of any unprejudiced student of the question, Aldus stands clearly convicted of being an extremely unsafe textual critic of Pliny's *Letters*. Many of his emendations are excellent; but too many exhibit an utterly irresponsible treatment

of the manuscripts and frequently a careless misinterpretation of Pliny's (or of Trajan's) words.

At the meeting of the American Philological Association held at Princeton University, December 28–30, 1915, Messrs. E. A. Loew and E. K. Rand made their first public announcement of the discovery in the J. Pierpont Morgan Library of six leaves of an uncial manuscript of Pliny's *Letters*, which they believe to be a fraction of the veritable Parisinus. They have with great kindness supplied me with a collation of the text and permitted me also to examine photographs of it at my leisure. If it be surely proved that the fragment is a part of Parisinus, evidently it also might be used to test the procedure of Aldus in his editorial work. But it unfortunately covers a passage (ii. 20. 13 *cessit ut ipse*—iii. 5. 4 *uiginti quibus*) which is found in great part in all three classes of the manuscripts accessible to Aldus, and hence it is not so sure a touchstone as the transcripts I have discussed above, which are of passages that existed for Aldus in Parisinus alone. Moreover, though the discoverers orally discussed the text at some length at the Princeton meeting, they have not yet printed their final conclusions, and therefore I naturally refrain from the examination of it here, even for the limited purpose of this article. Any student of such matters will appreciate the difficulty of proving positively from so short an extract, and that of this particular part of the *Letters*, the identity of the Morgan fragment with Parisinus. The editors will doubtless also wrestle with such problems, for example, as of showing that it is not merely a part of a manuscript of the "ten-book family" closely allied to **BF,** the immediate archetype of which never extended beyond v. 6. Yet even if it were so, the manuscript might be of equal practical value, if not of equal sentimental value, with a relic of Parisinus itself. At all events, granted the genuineness of the fragment (the editors will of course assure us on that point), there cannot fail to be much interest attaching to even a fragmentary uncial manuscript, which so far antedates any previously known copies of the *Letters*.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

# REFERENCES IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE TO PLAYS, PLAYERS, AND PLAYWRIGHTS[1]

### By Charles Knapp

Writers of plays in ancient days frequently remind us that we are in a theater, looking at things fictitious. In Plautus references to comedy and tragedy, to the theater, spectators, etc., are frequent,[2] both in prologues and in plays proper. In Terence references of this sort are common in the prologues; in the body of a play they are infrequent, but one at least is significant (*Hec.* 865–68).

In considering, first, definite references to plays we shall begin with passages from the prologues of Plautus, because their Plautine authorship has been so often called in question. Recently, however, scholars have inclined to regard these prologues as, in the main, from Plautus' hand.[3] Still, these prologues are *extra fabulam.*

In *Am.* 41–45 there is a mocking reference to the practice whereby in tragedy deities recite what they have done for mortals. In 51, Mercury, the prologist, declares *argumentum huius eloquar tragoediae.* From 51–63 we learn that audiences preferred comedy to tragedy.[4] Again, a rough distinction is made between tragedy and comedy; to the former, gods and kings, i.e., personages (themes) remote from everyday life, belong; to the latter, slaves (everyday affairs).[5] The

---

[1] In the main, the references are specific; occasionally, however, for its interest, a passage is included in which the reference is only implicit.

[2] Similar things occur in Greek literature. Cf. e.g., Aristophanes *Aves* 296; *Nubes* 326 (see Van Leeuwen and Starkie there); *Aves* 512; *Nubes* 553–56.

[3] See, e.g., Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*[2] (referred to hereafter merely as Leo), IV, "Die Prologe," pp. 188–247, *passim.*

[4] I assume that the reader has Lindsay's or Leo's text at hand (I use Lindsay's), and so I refrain, except in cases of special importance, from quotation. Capitalization, punctuation, and, occasionally, spelling are my own.

[5] We must not take this very seriously. The prologues to the *Aulularia,* the *Trinummus,* and the *Rudens* are spoken by gods. Skutsch, *Rhein. Mus.,* 55. 272, held that Fides spoke the prologue to the *Casina.* On that prologue see Leo, pp. 207–8. I strongly incline to regard the prologue to the *Rudens* as wholly or largely Plautine; cf. Leo, pp. 211–13. However, if it be objected that, in any case, the prologue, as *extra fabulam,* counts less heavily than the body of a play, note that in *Ci.* 149–202 Auxilium speaks what is in effect a prologue (in several places I have chosen, for convenience, to designate as quasi-prologues expository passages. Leo, IV, "Die

preference of audiences for comedy is emphasized again in *Ca.*, Prol.
58–66.[1]  Both passages recite a well-known fact.  The suggestion
that gods belong rather to tragedy is repeated in *Am.*, Prol. 86–93.
There the spectators are bidden not to wonder because Jupiter
bothers his head about actors or because he is to have a part in the
*Amphitruo* (86–90).   In 91–93,

> etiam, histriones anno quom in proscaenio hic
> Iovem invocarunt, venit, auxilio is fuit.
> Praeterea certo prodit in tragoedia,

we have a mocking allusion to some comedy[2] lately performed, quite
in harmony with the allusions made by Terence to recent perform-
ances of plays by his hostile critic, Luscius Lanuvinus (*Hau.*, Prol.
30–34, *Ph.*, Prol. 6–8; see below, pp. 37, 54).   A clear-cut allusion to
one of Plautus' own plays is seen in *Ba.* 212–15 (quoted below, p. 39).
In *Ba.* 910–12 (Chrysalus servos speaks) we have an allusion to
characters in some familiar *comoedia palliata* (cf. Horace *Serm.* i. 4.
48–52).

In the passages thus far considered we have had *comoedia*,
*tragoedia*, and *tragicomoedia*.  We may proceed, then, by assembling
the remaining places in which these and kindred terms appear.

*Comoedia*, naturally, is the commonest.   It occurs most often in
the prologues, in references to the play about to be produced;  see
*Am.* 55, 60, 88, 96; *As.* 13; *Cas.* 10, 30 (see 29–34); *Mi.* 84, 86;
*Mer.* 3; *Poe.* 50–55; *Tru.* 11; *Me.* 7–12; *Cas.* 11–20:

> Nos postquam populi rumore intelleximus
> studiose expetere vos Plautinas fabulas,
> anticuam eiius edimus comoediam
> quam vos probastis qui estis in senioribus;
>
> .    .    .    .    .    .    .    .    .    .
>
> Haec quom primum acta est, vicit omnis fabulas.
> Ea tempestate flos poetarum fuit
> qui nunc abierunt hinc in communem locum.
> Sed tamen apsentes prosunt <pro> praesentibus.

Prologe," pp. 188–247, *passim*, had, I find, done this).   On the other hand, slaves
often appear in tragedy.

The implication of the prologue to the *Amphitruo* that comedy belongs to the
sphere of everyday life recalls Horace *Serm.* 1. 4. 40–62, especially 45–56.   See
Cicero *Orator* 67, cited by Wickham on 42, and Plautus *Ba.* 1207–10 (below, p. 46).

[1] This passage Professor Morris regards as genuine;  see his note on 68, and cf.
Leo, pp. 204–5.

[2] For the allusion in 91–93 see also below, pp. 49–50, the discussion of *Mer.* 3 ff.

In *Cas.* 23–26[1] there is a reference to the current *ludi* (*scaenici;* see below, p. 45). In 62–78 there are bits of dramatic criticism. The *adulescens* who is vitally interested in the outcome of the play had been sent, before the play began, to the country. Meeting a criticism which might be passed upon the play (or had been passed upon the play), the prologist (64–66) explains, laughingly, why he will not return. In 52–56 the prologist had referred to the marriage of slaves.[2] In 67–78 he meets criticism of the inclusion of such matter in a play. Cf. *Pe.* 23–29, a dialogue between slaves, and *St.* 447–52, a good passage.

Within the plays *comoedia* occurs in *Am.* 868; *Ca.* 1033; *Cis.* 787; *Mo.* 1149–51, a very important passage:

> *Th.:*  Quid ego nunc faciam?  *Tr.:*  Si amicus Diphilo aut Philemonies,
>   dicito is quo pacto tuos te servos ludificaverit:
>   optumas frustrationes dederis in comoediis;

Ps. 1082–83 (Ballio leno); *Ps.* 1240; *Am.* 984–90 (a mocking reference to certain scenes in comedy; cf. *Ca.* 778, 788 ff., and see p. 38):

> Concedite atque apscedite omnes, de via decedite,
> nec quisquam tam avidax fuat homo qui obviam opsistat mihi,
> nam mihi quidem hercle qui minus liceat deo minitarier
> populo, ni decedat mihi, quam servolo in comoediis?
> Ille navem salvam nuntiat aut irati adventum senis:
> ego sum Iovi dicto audiens, eius iussu nunc huc me adfero,
> quam ob rem mihi magis par est via decedere et concedere.

With this cf. *Hau.* 28–32: the prologist had, in 16–21, met the charge that Terence had practiced *contaminatio*, in 23–27 the charge that Terence owed his success *amicum ingenium*, not *natura sua;* he now picks flaws in Luscius' plays. See, further, *Poe.* 1370–71; *Mi.* 79–87. *Tr.* 705–6 will be discussed below, pp. 43–44.

In Terence *comoedia* occurs but seldom. It is found (1) in prologues, *An.* 26; *Hau.* 4; *Ph.* 25; (2) *Hec.* 866. Terence preferred *fabula* to *comoedia*. Often, in talking of plays, he uses a feminine adjective, with a noun (doubtless *fabula*) to be supplied. Cf., e.g., *Eu.*, Prol. 8 (*bis*); *Hau.*, Prol. 29.

---

[1] On this prologue see Leo, pp. 207–8.

[2] In *Mi.* 1007–8 Palaestrio servos talks of getting married, though he has as yet no prospect of freedom. In *Ad.* 973 a slave, just manumitted, refers to his mate, not yet free, as *uxor mea*.

References for *tragoedia* are *Am.*, Prol. 41, 51; *Poe.*, Prol. 2; *Cu.* 591–92.

*Comicus* appears in *Ca.*, Prol. 61 *comico choragio; Ca.* 778–79 (Ergasilus parasitus, full of good news, speaks): "eodem pacto ut comici servi solent, coniciam in collum pallium,"[1] . . . ; *Poe.* 597 (see 597–99) (Advocati) Aurum . . . comicum (lupines used as stage money). In *Pe.* 465, in reply to a question by Toxilus servos: "Sed satin estis meditati?" Sagaristio says: "Tragici et comici numquam aeque sunt meditati." In *Poe.* 581 the cook says, "quin edepol condoctior sum quam tragoedi aut comici." See also *Ru.* 1249–53:

> Spectavi ego pridem comicos ad istunc modum
> sapienter dicta dicere, atque is plaudier,
> quom illos sapientes mores monstrabant poplo:
> sed quom inde suam quisque ibant divorsi domum,
> nullus erat illo pacto ut illi iusserant.

*Comoedice* occurs in *Mi.* 213, just after Plautus (209–12) has referred to Naevius' imprisonment.

*Tragicus* and *tragoedus* occur once each: *Pe.* 465; *Poe.* 581. In *Poe.* 1168 Leo, by conjecture, reads *tragicae.* Lindsay has a very different text. (See *The Classical Quarterly*, XII, 140.)

The use of *poeta* in Plautus I have discussed in *Classical Philology*, XII, 149–50. Add *Cas.*, Prol. 18 (see above, p. 36); *Men.* 7; *Mi.* 209–12 *poetae* . . . . *barbaro. Poema* occurs only in *As.* 174: see *Classical Philology*, XII, 149, n. 2.

In the prologues of Terence' plays Terence is often called *poeta: An.* 1; *Hau.* 2; *Eu.* 3, (23), 28; *Ph.* 1, (14); *Ad.* 1, 25. In like complimentary sense *poeta* is used (*Hec.* 21) of Caecilius. With derogatory epithets *poeta* is sneeringly applied to Luscius Lanuvinus, in *An.* 6–7; *Hau.* 23; *Ph.* 1 (in *Ph.* 13 *vetus*.. . . . *poeta*, in a quotation, is probably not derogatory).

Part of the player's activity, dancing, Plautus describes by implication as *ars ludicra* (*Au.* 626). *Ludius*, 'dancer,' occurs in *Au.* 401–2, *volsus ludius; Cu.* 150–51 (see 147–55). In *Pe.* 824–26 two kinds of dances, the *staticulus* and the Ionic dance, and two well-known dancers, Hegea and Diodorus, are named. The Ionic dance is named also in *Ps.* 1274a–1277a; *St.* 769. See also *St.* 755 ff.,

---

[1] Cf. *Ph.* 844–45.

774 ff. The character of the dancing—its indecency—is indicated by the last passages and by *Me.* 196–99, 511–17.

To denote the dramatic art Terence uses *ars musica* (*Hec.*, Prol. 23, 46; *Ph.*, Prol. 17), *studium musicum* (*Hau.*, Prol. 23), *studium* (*Hec.*, Prol. 19, 23), beside *ars musica* (*Hec.*, Prol., 53; *Ph.*, Prol. 2), *ars* (*Hau.*, Prol. 48).

*Fabula* appears in Plautus forty times. The thirty-two passages in which it denotes a play may be grouped as follows:

1. Passages involving the phrase *fabulam agere*: *Am.*, Prol. 94–95; *Ca.*, Prol. 52; *Cas.*, Prol. 17; *Me.*, Prol. 72 (see 72–76); *Mo.* 1181; *Poe.* 550–52; *Ps.* 720–21.

2. In appeals for silence or for applause: *Am.*, Prol. 15–16; *Ca.*, Prol. 54 (see 54–58); *Ca.* 1029 (see 1029–36); *Mo.* 1181; *Poe.* 1370; *Ps.* 1334 (see 1331–34); *Ru.* 1421 (see 1418–23); *Tr.* 22; *Tru.* 967–68.

3. In passages which name the play to be performed or refer to its *argumentum*: *As.*, Prol. 7 (see 6–12); *Tr.*, Prol. 16 (see 16–22).

4. In passages involving the phrase *fabulam facere*: *Ca.* 55, 1029; *Mer.* 1007; *Cas.* 1006.

5. In passages involving the phrase *fabulam transigere*: *Cas.*, Prol. 84; *Ps.* 564.

6. In passages involving the phrase *fabulam spectare*: *Cas.*, Prol. 6 (see 5–20); *Ba.* 215.

7. *Ps.* 1–2 (the only verses extant of the prologue):

> Exporgi meliust lumbos atque exsurgier:[1]
> Plautina longa fabula in scaenam venit.

8. *Ba.* 211–15:

> Pi.: Immo— Ch.: Immo hercle abiero
> potius. Pi.: Num invitus rem bene gestam audis eri?
> Ch.: Non res, sed actor mihi cor odio sauciat.
> Etiam Epidicum, quam ego fabulam aeque ac me ipsum amo,
> nullam aeque invitus specto, si agit Pellio.

Conversely, for the value of good acting, see what is said on page 54 about L. Ambivius Turpio's relation to the plays of Caecilius, and *Ph.*, Prol. 9–11.[2]

---

[1] Cf. *Tru.* 967–68; *Ep.* 733.

[2] Contrast Terence' jeer at Luscius, in *Ph.*, Prol. 9–11: "quod si intellegeret, quom stetit olim nova, actoris opera magis stetisse quam sua, minus multo audacter quam nunc laedit laederet."

9. Instructive, too, is *Poe.* 3–8. Verse 8 clearly implies the performance of two or more plays in sequence on one day. Cf., then, *Ps.* 1–2, quoted under 7, above. Important, too, are the closing verses of the *Pseudolus* (1332–35, especially 1334–35, Pseudolus servos). Evidently a play or plays had preceded the *Pseudolus*, and there was to be a dramatic performance next day. One might even guess, from *Plautina* (*Ps.*, Prol. 2), that the preceding play had been a play by another author (unless, indeed, the emphasis is on *longa*. In that case see below, p. 41. See Morris on *Ps.* 1334 f., and Lorenz, *Pseudolus*, p. 1).

In eight passages *fabula* more or less completely = 'bit of fiction,' 'fiction,' 'mummery': *Ca.*, Prol. 52; *Me.* 724, 1077; *Mi.* 293; *Mo.* 510, 937; *Pe.* 788; *Ru.* 355.

Terence uses *fabula*, 'play,' 'comedy,' in his prologues only, in passages involving certain familiar phrases:[1]

1. *Fabulam facere: An.* 3, (9), (12); (*Hau.* 17); (*Eu.* 8, 34); *Ph.* 4.

2. *Fabulam dare:* (*Hau.* 33–34); *Eu.* 24; *Hec.* 1.

3. *Fabulam scribere:* (*Hau.* 43); (*Eu.* 7); (*Hec.* 6, 8, 27, 56); (*Ad.* 16).

4. *Fabulam discere:* (*Hec.* 14–15: spoken by Ambivius Turpio, 18–19, 56).

5. *Fabulam agere:* (*Hau.* 36); (*Eu.* 19, 22); (*Hec.* 18, 30); (*Ad.* 12).

6. *Fabulam cognoscere, noscere:* used of coming to know, and so to value rightly, a play: (*Hec.* 3, 8, 20).

7. *Fabulam spectare:* (*Hec.* 3, 20).

8. *Fabulam inspicere*, said of watching a rehearsal, or of a private view, of a play before the aediles: (*Eu.* 21).

9. *Fabulam referre:* (*Hec.* 7, 29, 38).

10. *Fabulam vendere:* (*Hec.* 7).

11. *Fabulam emere:* (*Eu.* 20: plays bought by the aediles); (*Hec.* 57: plays bought by Ambivius Turpio).

12. *Exigere fabulam*, 'to cause a play to fail,' 'to disapprove a play': (*Hec.* 13).

---

[1] In many passages *fabula* does not actually occur (see above, p. 37, on Terence' use of *comoedia* and of *fabula*); I have included these passages, setting the references to them, however, in parentheses.

13. *Fabula stat* (*stetit, stetisse*), *fabula placet, fabula inveterascit*, of a play succeeding: (*Ph.* 9–10); *An.* 3; *Hec.* 12.[1]

14. *Fabulam contaminare: An.* 16; (*Hau.* 17).

In *Ad.*, Prol. 22, we have *argumentum fabulae*.

For *fabula, fabulae*, in the sense of 'mummery,' etc. (see above, p. 40), in Terence see, e.g., *An.* 224, 553, 747; *Hau.* 337.

*Argumentum*, 'plot,' occurs as follows:

1. In prologues: *Am.* 51, 96; *As.* 8; *Me.* 5; *Mer.* 2; *Mi.* 79, 85, 98 (the expository speech of Palaestrio servos, 79–155, is virtually a prologue: see above, p. 35, n. 5); *Tr.* 16; *Vi.* 10; *An.* 6,[2] 11; *Ad.* 22. Cf. *Me.* 13–16; *Poe.* 46 (see 46–58). *Ci.* 155 seems to stand outside a prologue, but in effect verses 149–202, spoken by Auxilium, form a prologue (see above, p. 35, n. 5).

2. In the body of a play: *Tr.* 707.

In *Tr.*, Prol. 16–17 *argumentum* and *res* are both used in the sense of 'plot.' In *Ba.* 212, in a *lusus verborum*, *res* = 'plot,' 'story,' 'play.'

Certain passages make it plain that there was a conventional length (about 1,000 verses?)[3] for a play. Cf. first *Ps.*, Prol. 1–2 (quoted above, p. 39). There are 1,334 verses in this play. *Ps.* 388 is better: "nolo bis iterari; sat sic longae fiunt fabulae." See Morris on 388; Lorenz on 376, and *Einleitung zum Pseudolus*, *Anm.* 35. Compare next *Cas.* 1006 (see 1004–6), "hanc ex longa longiorem ne faciamus fabulam." In its present form, in Lindsay's text, the *Casina* has 1,018 verses, but evidently much has been lost. Cf. next the talk of Eutychus adulescens with Lysimachus and Demipho, senes, *Mer.* 1003–8, especially 1005–8 (there are 1,026 verses in this play). Possibly *Cas.* 1012–14, *Ci.* 782–85, and *An.* 980–81 belong here.[4]

---

[1] Kindred phrases are seen in *Hec.*, Prol. 15: *sum . . . . exactus; Hec.*, Prol. 36 (Ambivius Turpio): "fecere ut ante tempus exirem foras"; *Hec.*, Prol. 21 (Ambivius): "Ita poetam restitui in locum"; *Ph.*, Prol. 32–34: "per tumultum noster grex motus locost, quem actoris virtus nobis restituit locum . . . ."; *Hec.*, Prol. 39: *placeo* (cf. *Ad.*, Prol. 18); *Hec.*, Prol. 42: "Ergo interea meum non potui tutari locum."

[2] *An.* 1–7 explains why the word is so rare in Terence.

[3] The *Andria, Hecyra*, and *Adelphoe* have each less than 1,000 verses; the other plays of Terence have less than 1,100 verses each. Of Plautus' plays the following have less than 1,000 verses: *Asinaria, Aulularia* (832, plus 8 fragmentary verses; the play is, however, incomplete), *Cistellaria, Curculio, Epidicus, Persa, Stichus*, and the *Truculentus*. The *Captivi* has 1,036 verses, the *Mercator*, 1,026.

[4] We may, perhaps, compare also *Ep.* 665 (Epidicus servos): *Abeo intro: nimis longum loquor; Poe.* 1224 (spoken by Agorastocles adulescens to Hanno Poenus): "In pauca confer: sitiunt qui sedent" (see Boxhorn, in Naudet's edition). In various

We take up now references to the actors.

The word *actor*, 'actor,' occurs but once in Plautus (*Ba.* 213, quoted above, p. 39). For *histrio* cf. *Tru.* 931 (see 930–32); *Poen.*, Prol. 20; *Ca.*, Prol. 13; *Am.*, Prol. 64–85 (*ter*). For (*ars*) *histrionia* see *Am.*, Prol. 91, 151–52. In *Poe.*, Prol. 4 (a fine passage) we have, in a παρὰ προσδοκίαν passage, *imperator . . . . histricus;* in *Poen.*, Prol. 44 we have *imperata quae sunt pro imperio histrico.* In *Am.*, Prol. 69–72 we have *histrio* and *artifex* (*scaenicus*) differentiated. *Artifex* appears also in *Poen.*, Prol. 40. Terence uses *actor*, 'actor,' in *Ph.*, Prol. 10 (quoted above, p. 39, n. 2).

*Grex*, 'company of actors,' occurs in *As.*, Prol. 1–3, along with *domini* (*gregis*) and *conductores* (*gregis*); *Cas.*, Prol. 21–22; *Ps.* 1334; *Hau.*, Prol. 43–45. Over *As.* 942–47; *Ba.* 1207–11; and *Ep.* 732–33, in each case the closing verses of the play, the heading "Grex" is set. In *Tr.* 866 the sycophanta calls the man who had hired him to play his tricks in that comedy *ille conductor meus;* in 853–56 he uses *conduco* twice and *conductor* once of the same proceeding.

The term *caterva* does not occur in Plautus or in Terence in the sense of 'company of actors.' It appears as a heading over the closing verses of the Captivi (1029–36) and of the Cistellaria (782–87). In *Pe.* 858, Lindsay, without MSS warrant, sets "Caterva" before *Plaudite*, the last word of the play.

*Cas.* Prol. 70, *novom attulerunt, quod fit nusquam gentium*, is in order here, since the main verb is plural; its subject is *scaenici*, or *artifices scaenici*, a term broad enough to include both playwright and company.

Many scholars hold that the closing words in each play of Terence—a brief bid for applause—were spoken by the Cantor; see the editors, e.g., Fairclough and Ashmore, on *An.* 981.

In various passages reference is made to the conventional rôles of the *fabula palliata*. Cf. *Ba.* 649–50:

---

passages an actor refuses to tell another something unknown to that other, though known to the audience; cf., e.g., *Ep.* 656–63; *Poe.* 920–21; *Ps.* 718–21 (a good passage); *Ps.* 687: "Sed iam satis est philosophatum. Nimis diu et longum loquor"; *Tr.* 1077; *Hau.* 335–36. These passages may belong here. But of course there is good artistic reason, of an entirely different sort, for this refusal. Ashmore (*Terence*, introductory note to *Eu.* 207 ff.) reminds us that Donatus speaks contemptuously of the fact that this scene (207 ff.) tells things already known.

> Non mihi isti placent Parmenones, Syri,[1]
> qui duas aut tris minas auferunt eris;

*Men.*, Prol. 72–76 (an important passage); *Ca.*, Prol. 57–58 (*leno, meretrix, miles gloriosus*); *Ca.* 1029–32 (stock themes); *Eu.*, Prol. 26 (*parasitus*), 30–31 (*parasitus, miles gloriosus*), 35–41 (a fine passage); *Hau.*, Prol. 35–40 (a fine passage).

In connection with the training of actors we may note first the phrase *fabulam discere* (see above, under *fabula* 4, p. 40). For more specific references to rehearsals see *Poe.* 550–56. This interesting and important passage gives us the verb *docere* (*fabulam, vel actores*); hence cf. *Poe.* 578–81 (the opening verses of Act III, scene 2).

In *Tr.* 627–704 Lysiteles adulescens tries, in vain, to persuade Lesbonicus adulescens to give him his sister in marriage, *sine dote*. In 705–8 Stasimus servos, who has heard the whole discussion, exclaims

> Non enim possum quin exclamem, Eugae, eugae, Lysiteles, πάλιν!
> facile palmam habes: hic victust, vicit tua comoedia.
> Hic agit magis ex argumento et vorsus meliores facit.
> Etiam ob stultitiam tuam te † curis † multabo mina.

On this passage see Brix-Niemeyer[5], on 707 and 707 f., and Marquardt-Wissowa, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*[2], III, 542. There seems to be no evidence that at Rome dramatic poets contended against one another at the *ludi* for prizes, at least in the days of Plautus and Terence. Since the bringing over from a Greek play into a Latin play of a very definite Greek practice that was without parallel in Roman practice would be, to say the least, flat, we must see in 706–7 only a general statement, expressed, to be sure, in more or less theatrical terms, but applicable to any age and any country. The idea apparently advanced in 708 that the defeated(?) poet was in some way punished Brix-Niemeyer regard as "auch eine ingeniöse Erfindung des Sklaven." To Professor Morris the verses are a "late interpolation." Neither *Cas.*, Prol. 17 nor *Ph.*, Prol. 16–17 need imply a specific contest between playwrights.

---

[1] Plautus has no slave named Parmeno or Syrus. A Parmeno servos is a character in the *Eunuchus*, the *Hecyra*, and the *Adelphoe*. A Syrus servos appears in the *Hauton* and the *Adelphoe;* Syra lena appears in the *Cistellaria*, Syra anus in the *Mercator* and *Hecyra*, Syra tonstrix in the *Truculentus*. Cf. also in this connection Horace *Serm.* i. 6. 38.

Contests between actors may or may not be implied in *Tr.* 708 (see above). But, clearly, actors were rewarded for good work and punished for bad (this would surely lead to rivalry between them). Cf. (1) Passages from the body of a play: *Tr.* 990 (sycophanta): "vapulabis meo arbitratu et novorum aedilium" (see Morris and Brix-Niemeyer, *ad loc.*). In *Cas.* 952–58 Naudet saw a reference to the flogging of actors. (2) Passages from the close of a play: *As.* 946–47 (see Gray's good note); *Ci.* 784–85. (3) Passages in prologues: *Am.* 24–31 (see Palmer on 27), 64–78 (the passage proves that the awards were made, at times, by the aediles); *Poe.* 36–39 (contains reference to the giving of prizes, by favoritism, by the *curatores ludorum*).

Since favor and prizes were to be won, it is not surprising that there were organized efforts, directed in part by the actors themselves, through claques, letters, go-betweens, etc., to influence the award: *Am.*, Prol. 64–78, 81–85. All this gives deeper meaning to the appeals for applause (see below, p. 46).

At least two passages contain reference to an encore: *Tr.* 705–8 (see above, p. 43), and *Ps.* 1275–79 (an allusion to something that had taken place off stage, but pertinent to our inquiry). πάλιν and *parum* are the words used to call for the repetition.

For allusions to the *choragus* see *Pe.* 159–60: "Aps chorago sumito <ornamenta>; dare debet: praebenda aediles locaverunt"; *Tr.* 858; *Cu.* 462–66 (a choragus speaks, through 486):

> Edepol nugatorem lepidum lepide hunc nactust Phaedromus.
> Halophantam an sucophantam magis esse dicam nescio.
> Ornamenta quae locavi metuo ut possim recipere;
> quamquam cum istoc mihi negoti nihil est: ipsi Phaedromo
> credidi; tamen adservabo.

See Naudet on the first verse of this scene. Cf. *comico choragio*, *Ca.*, Prol. 61.

References to the costumes of actors would be in place here. They have been well treated by Professor Catharine Saunders, *Costume in Roman Comedy*.

To the theater as a physical thing Plautus refers at times. Cf. *Am.*, Prol. 66–68 (*cavea*); *Tru.* 931 (*cavea*); *Poe.* 20 (*scaena*); *Ps.* 2 (*scaena*); *Ps.* 568 (*scaena*); *Poe.*, Prol. 17–18: "scortum exoletum

ne quis in proscaenio sedeat"; *Am.*, Prol. 91–92 (*proscaenium*); *Poe.* 55–57 (*proscaenium*). *Theatrum* occurs in *Ps.* 1081. References to seats, too, would be in order, but these I plan to deal with at another time.

In Plautus, as often elsewhere in Latin, *ludi*, without qualifying adjective (*scaenici*), is used of the games at which theatrical performances were given: *Cas.*, Prol. 23–28 (an interesting passage); *Poe.*, Prol. 36–42; *Ru.* 535 (important); *Me.*, Prol. 29 (perhaps); *Ci.* 156–57. Kindred are *Ps.* 546 (see Morris, *ad loc.;* Lorenz on 524); *Ps.* 552; *Pe.* 771a. One example of the phrase *ludos facere,* 'cozen,' is in point (*Mo.* 427–28):

> Ludos ego hodie vivo praesenti hic seni
> faciam, quod credo mortuo numquam fore.

Plays, we remember, were produced at *ludi* (*funebres*); cf. the Didascaliae to the *Adelphoe* and the *Hecyra*. In *Hec.*, Prol. 44–45, we have "vobis datur potestas condecorandi ludos scaenicos."[1] Reference is made also to the *praeco,* whose hard task it was to quiet the audience: *As.*, Prol. 4–5; *Poe.*, Prol. 11–16. These passages prove that the *praeco* got pay, but they do not tell who was paymaster. In *Poe.*, Prol. 19–22, there is reference to *dissignatores,* 'ushers.'

*Tr.* 990 (quoted above, p. 44) shows that the *Trinummus* was performed shortly after the induction of certain aediles into office. From a play proper cf. for the aediles, *Pe.* 157–60; from prologues cf. *Am.* 72, 80; *Poe.* 52. In *Eu.*, Prol. 20, there is reference to the purchase of the *Eunuchus*, from Terence, by the aediles. In *Hec.*, Prol. 1–7, the sale of a play by the poet is mentioned, but the aediles are not named as purchasers. *Eu.*, Prol. 21–26, implies a rehearsal of the *Eunuchus*, at which a magistrate (aedile?) and Luscius were present; as a result Luscius charged Terence with 'contaminatio' and plagiarism (see below, pp. 52, 53, 54–55). Once there is reference to music between 'acts': *Ps.* 573a.

We consider next the audience. *Poe.*, Prol. 32–36, proves the presence of women (*matronae, mulieres*); *Poe.*, Prol. 28–31, that *nutrices*, with *infantes minutuli*, might be present; *Poe.*, Prol. 41–45,

---

[1] In *Poe.* 1290–91 and *Pe.* 433–36 *ludi* refers rather to *ludi circenses;* in *Poe.* 1010–12 the reference is to a *venatio*, i.e., to *ludi amphitheatrales.*

that *pedisequi* came with their masters. *Ru.* 1249–53 also proves
that slaves were in the audience, but clearest by far on that point
is *Poe.*, Prol. 23–27. From *Poe.*, Prol. 5–10, 21–22, we see that spec-
tators came very early in the morning.

Of the spectators the playwrights were ever conscious. Fre-
quently an actor or a group of actors addresses the spectators
directly, using the word *spectatores*.[1] The passages fall into three
groups:

1. Passages in prologues: *Am.* 66; *As.* 1; *Cas.* 1–4; *Me.* 2.

2. Passages at the ends of plays, passages to all intents and pur-
poses *extra fabulam* (and so much like those in Group 1); often there
is, in such passages, an appeal for approval of the play. Cf. (*a*) Pas-
sages spoken by an individual (the name and the rôle of the speaker
are given in parentheses): *Am.* 1146 (Iuppiter); *Cas.* 1012–18
(Chalinus servos: an entertaining passage); *Cu.* 728–29 (Phaedro-
mus adulescens); *Me.* 1162 (Messenio servos); *Mo.* 1181 (Theo-
propides senex); *Pe.* 858 (Toxilus servos); *Poe.* 550–54 (Advocati);
*Ru.* 1418–23 (Daemones senex); *St.* 774–75 (Stichus servos); *Tru.*
968 (Phronesium meretrix); *Mer.* 1015–26 (an especially interesting
passage: in place of *spectatores* we have *senes* plus *adulescentes*).
(*b*) In passages spoken by the Grex or by the Caterva: *Ba.* 1208–12:

> Hi senes nisi fuissent nihili iam inde ab adulescentia,
> non hodie hoc tantum flagitium facerent canis capitibus;
> neque adeo haec faceremus, ni antehac vidissemus fieri
> ut apud lenones rivales filiis fierent patres.
> Spectatores, vos valere volumus, clare adplaudere;[2]

*Ca.* 1029–36; *Ci.* 782–87.

3. In the body of a play: *Am.* 997–98 (Mercurius); *Ba.* 1070–73
(Chrysalus servos); *Ci.* 678–81 (spoken by Halisca ancilla, who is
looking for the lost *cistella*):

> Mei homines, mei spectatores, facite indicium, si quis vidit
> quis eam apstulerit, quisve sustulerit, et utrum hac an illac iter institerit.
> Non sum scitior quae hos rogem aut quae fatigem,
> qui semper malo muliebri sunt lubentes;[3]

---

[1] For addresses to the spectators in Aristophanes see, e.g., *Aves* 30 ff., *Equites*
36 ff., *Vespae* 54 ff., *Pax* 50 ff., *Achar.* 496, 513.

[2] Here, as in Horace *Serm.* i. 4. 48–53, comedy holds the mirror up to life. See
p. 35, n. 5, above. In *Cato Maior* 65 Cicero illustrates life by an appeal to the *Adelphoe*
of Terence. Cf. also Cicero *Laelius* 100; 98: "Nec parasitorum in comoediis adsen-
tatio faceta nobis videretur, nisi essent milites gloriosi."

[3] With this abuse of the audience by an actor cf. *Au.* 716 (quoted below, p. 47).

*Mer.* 160: "Dormientis spectatores metuis ne ex somno excites?";
*Poe.* 550–54 (Advocati); *Poe.* 597–99 (Advocati); *Ps.* 720 (Pseudolus
servos); *St.* 673–75 (Stephanium ancilla); *Tru.* 105 (Astaphium
ancilla); *Tru.* 482–83 (Stratophanes miles).

At times the spectators are directly addressed or directly referred
to, though the word *spectatores* is not used.

1. In prologues, naturally, since the task of the prologist was to
win the audience to good humor: *vos*, as more intimate and less
formal than *spectatores*, is the usual form of address.  Cf. *Am.* 1–16,
20–27, 32–49, 50–96, 110–11, 142–47, 151–52; *As.* 7, 9–12, 14–15;
*Ca.* 1–6, 10–16,[1] 23, 52, 53–58; *Cas.* 5–16, 21–24, 29–30, 64–66, 67–78,
87–88; *Cis.* 147–48 (lena):[2] "Haec sic res gesta est.  Si quid usus
venerit, meminisse ego hanc rem vos volo.  Ego abeo domum,"
149–56, 170 (Auxilium): "ut eampse vos audistis confiterier" (a
reference to the soliloquy of the lena, 120–48), 197–202; *Me.* 1–16,
23, 47–55; *Mer.* 8,[3] 14–15, 17, 37, 103; *Mi.* 79–82,[4] 83–87, 96–99,
150–53; *Poe.* 3–10, 17–35, 40–45, 46–55, 62–63, 79–82 (cf. *Me.*, Prol.
49–55), 91–92, 116–17, 125–28; *Ru.* 3, 28–31, 80–81, 82; *Tr.* 4–7,
10–11, 20–22.

2. At the ends of plays, in bids for applause: *As.* 942–47 (Grex);
*Ep.* 733 (Grex); *Mi.* 1437 (Pyrgopolinices miles); *Poe.* 1370–71 (the
true ending of the play); *Poe.* 1423 (Caterva), the *exitus alter* of the
play.

3. In the body of a play: *Am.* 867–68; *Aul.* 715–20 (Euclio senex
avarus):

> Opsecro ego vos, mi auxilio,
> oro, optestor, sitis et hominem demonstretis, quis eam apstulerit.
> Quid ais tu?  Tibi credere certumst, nam esse bonum ex voltu cognosco.
> Quid est?  quid ridetis?  Novi omnis, scio fures esse hic compluris
> qui vestitu et creta occultant sese atque sedent quasi sint frugi.
> Hem, nemo habet horum?  Occidisti.  Dic igitur, quis habet?  Nescis?

[1] For this interchange of remarks between actor and spectator(s) cf. *Au.* 713–20 (discussed below, p. 47).

[2] It was remarked above, p. 35, n. 5, that Auxilium's speech (149–202) is a prologue-like passage, virtually a second prologue.  It might indeed be called a third prologue, since the lena in 120–48 really talks in prologue vein.  In 170 Auxilium, the divine speaker, refers back to what the lena had said (120–48)!

[3] For our present purposes *Mer.* 1–110 (spoken by Charinus adulescens) is virtually a prologue.

[4] Palaestrio's soliloquy (79–155) is in effect a prologue.  In 92–93 there is a reference to the *miles*, who had appeared with his parasite in 1–78, which is quite comparable to Auxilium's backward reference, pointed out in n. 2, above.

(with this most effective passage, involving interplay between actor and spectator[s], cf. *Ca.* 10–14 and *Ci.* 678–81. For the abuse of the spectators see Wagner on *Au.* 709, and cf. Aristophanes, e.g., *Nubes* 1096–1101, *Vespae* 73 ff., *Pax.* 565, *Ranae* 276 [see Van Leeuwen, *ad loc.*]); *Cas.* 879–80 (Olympio servos), 896–902 (involves an extraordinary bit of moralizing, in view of the morals of the play); *Cu.* 466–68 (choragus); *Me.* 880–81 (Menaechmus II adulescens): "vosque omnis quaeso, si senex revenerit, ni me indicetis qua platea hinc aufugerim" (cf. *Mi.* 859–62);[1] *Mer.* 267, 313; *Mi.* 859–62:

> Perii! Excruciabit me erus, domum si venerit,
> quom haec facta scibit, quia sibi non dixerim.
> Fugiam hercle aliquo atque hoc in diem extollam malum.
> Ne dixeritis, opsecro, huic, vostram fidem!

(cf. *Me.* 880–81); *Mi.* 1131; *Mo.* 280–81: "Verum illuc est; maxuma adeo pars vostrorum intellegit, quibus anus domi sunt uxores, quae vos dote meruerunt"; *Mo.* 708–10; *Poe.* 920–22, 1224 (Agorastocles adulescens): "In pauca confer; sitiunt qui sedent"; *Ps.* 562–73*a* (Pseudolus servos, at the close of an 'act': a passage of great interest and value); *Ps.* 584–86 (Pseudolus servos); *Ps.* 1234–35 (Ballio leno): "Nunc ne expectetis dum hac domum redeam via; ita res gestast, angiporta haec certum est consectarier"; *Ru.* 1383 (according to Kirk, *AJP*, XVIII, 35, n. 2); *St.* 446–48 (Stichus servos), 410–14.

4. In some passages it is difficult to decide whether the actor is of a sudden addressing the spectators (cf. the note to this page), or is speaking to himself, or is addressing the elements (cf. *Mer.* 1 ff., discussed below, pp. 49–50): *Au.* 658 (Euclio senex); *An.* 231–32 (Mysis ancilla); *Ba.* 161 (Lydus paedagogus); *Ca.* 966 (Hegio senex); *Ru.* 232 (Ampelisca ancilla); *An.* 877–81 (Simo senex); *Cas.* 685–88 (Pardalisca ancilla).

In various passages Plautus seems to be poking fun at conventional practices of the theater. Thus, when in *As.* 325 Libanus servos bids Leonida servos tell his news, Leonida rejoins: "Placide ergo unum quicquid rogita, ut adquiescam. Non vides me ex cursura anhelitum etiam ducere?" See Gray on 327. Leonida had entered

---

[1] Here the appeal to the (unnamed) spectators is decidedly abrupt; cf., e.g., *Mo.* 280–81, 708–10; *Mi.* 1131.

in hot haste at 267, full of good news which he wanted to impart to
Libanus, but he had been killing time since 297 in exchanging com-
pliments with Libanus.   The kind of scene that Plautus is here
laughing at he uses frequently.   Cf. the following passages, in all
of which a character, usually a slave, though in a hurry (so he
declares), lingers long before he tells his tale or performs his task:
*Ca.* 768–828 (Ergasilus parasitus: for definitely parodic elements see
778–80, which contain a reference to *servi comici;* 790–98, to be set
beside *Am.* 984–90, quoted above, p. 37; and the parasite's speeches
in 800–828); *Cu.* 277–327 (Curculio parasitus); *Ep.* 1 ff. (Thesprio
servos), 194–205 (important: to be set beside *Am.* 984–90, *Ca.* 778–
80); *Mer.* 109–60 (Acanthio servos: a delicious passage; cf. espe-
cially 109–10, 113–17, 126, 138; he does not tell his news till 180 ff.);
*Mer.* 842 ff. (Eutychus adulescens: he tells part of his tale, at last,
at 900 ff.); *Mo.* 348–62 (Tranio servos); *Ps.* 241–380 (Ballio leno:
he is in a hurry and busy [248], yet lingers [278, 380]); *An.* 228–300
(Mysis ancilla, sent after an obstetrix [cf. 459–73] lingers, though, it
must be noted, she effectively, in her lingering, advances her mis-
tress' cause).[1]

In *Mer.* 3–8 Charinus, the lovelorn adulescens, talks thus (the
play has no prologue; Charinus remains on the stage till 224, talking
with Acanthio servos, who enters at 111):

> Non ego item facio ut alios in comoediis
> <vi> vidi amoris facere, qui aut Nocti aut Dii
> aut Soli aut Lunae miserias narrant suas,
> quos pol ego credo humanas querimonias
> non tanti facere, quid velint, quid non velint;
> vobis narrabo potius meas nunc miserias.

In the extant remains of Greek and Roman drama, the practice here
ridiculed is characteristic of tragedy rather than of comedy (cf., e.g.,
the nurse's words in Euripides' *Medea* 57–58).   Still, *Ad.* 789–90
directly illustrates the practice from comedy.   There Demea senex,
by troubles beset, cries: "Ei mihi, quid faciam? quid agam? quid
clamem aut querar?   O caelum, o terra, o maria Neptuni!"   Perhaps
*Tr.* 1070–71 is in point.   There Stasmus servos, catching sight of his

---

[1] Various matters discussed in this paper have, I find, been treated by W. W. Blancké,
*The Dramatic Values in Plautus* (a University of Pennsylvania dissertation, 1918); see,
e.g., pp. 22–23, 45–48, 55–56, 64–65.

master, home after three years, cries: "Mare, terra, caelum, di
vostram fidem! Satin ego oculis plane video? estne ipsus an non
est? is est!" Still, the feeling may well be genuine here, and the
situation may thus, in effect, approach the tragic. Cf., too, *Am.*
882. Alcumena, charged by Amphitruo with dishonor, goes into the
house at 860; at 882 she re-enters, crying: "Durare nequeo in aedibus:
ita me probri, stupri, dedecoris a viro argutam meo!" She con-
tinues in this vein to 890.[1] In *Hec.* 865–68 occurs this dialogue
between Pamphilus adulescens and Bacchis meretrix:

*Pam.:* Dic mi, harum rerum num quid dixti meo patri? *Ba.:* Nil.
   *Pam.:* Neque opus est
adeo muttito: placet non fieri hoc itidem ut in comoediis,
omnia omnes ubi resciscunt. Hic quod fuerat par resciscere
sciunt, quos non autem aequomst scire neque resciscent neque
   scient.

See, finally, *Mi.* 200 ff. (Periplectomenus senex).

I feel sure that in the passages cited on pages 48–50 we are dealing
with allusions to the contemporary Roman stage. Such allusions
in Roman plays, if merely borrowed from Greek plays and without
specific application to Roman conditions, would have been decidedly

---

[1] In numerous other passages the custom is, I think, parodied. In these a char-
acter asks (no one in particular, or the spectators in general, or the elements) what
in the world he is to do. To be sure, situations of this sort have always occurred in
actual life. Yet, from Cicero *De oratore* iii. 214, 217 (here are cited parts of the
passages from Ennius which I quote below), 218; *Pro Murena* 88; and Quintilian xi.
3. 115 we see how utterly conventional was the kind of thing Charinus had in mind
in *Mer.* 3 ff., and what a splendid target it offered for parody. Take this passage,
from Ennius' tragic fragments (Ribbeck, 231–32):

   Quo nunc me vortam? quod iter incipiam ingredi?
   Domum paternamne anne ad Peliae filias?

I shall not stop to cite examples of this from Greek tragedy, but shall cite next
Andromacha's lament, from Ennius' *Andromacha Aechmalotis* (Ribbeck, 75–82):

   Quid petam praesidi aut exequar? quove nunc
   auxilio exili aut fugae freta sim?
   Arce et urbe orba sum. Quo accedam? quove applicem?
   cui neque arae patriae domi stant, fractae et disiectae iacent,
   fana flamma deflagrata, tosti alti stant parietes,
   deformati atque abiete crispa

   O pater, o patria, o Priami domus
   saeptum altisono cardine templum!

Now, of the last two verses at least of this passage I have long seen a parody in *Ba.*
933, part of that wonderful parody of plays, etc., on the Trojan story which Chrysalus
servos utters (*Ba.* 925–78). Next cf. *Ru.* 204 ff., where we must either imagine
elaborate setting of rocks and cliffs which hide the girls each from the other, or abso-
lute imperviousness, on Plautus' part, to the absurd, or, preferably, a burlesque of a
stage convention.

flat. Again, just so soon as there was a considerable body of Latin plays, familiar to Roman audiences (especially through reproduction; see *Cas.* 5–20), nothing could have prevented a keen-witted Roman audience from applying passages of this kind, whatever their provenance, to contemporary Roman rather than to (less-known) Greek plays.[1] Finally, we can, as was shown above (p. 36), bring some of the Plautine allusions of this sort into close connection with definite allusions by Terence to a definite Roman contemporary, Luscius Lanuvinus.

We pass now naturally to note that in *Ru.* 525–36 there is a reference to the *Fabulae Atellanae* in a dialogue between Charmides senex and Labrax leno, who have just escaped shipwreck. Verses 535–36 run as follows:

> *La.:* Quid si aliquo ad ludos me pro manduco locem?
> *Ch.:* Quapropter? *La.:* Quia pol clare crepito dentibus.

For the Manducus in the *Fabulae Atellanae* see Varro *L.L.* 7. 95; Munk, *De Fabulis Atellanis*, pp. 39 ff. With *Ru.* 535–36 compare Juvenal 3. 172 ff. (see Mayor and Wilson, *ad loc.*). In *Ba.* 1087 ff. Nicobulus senex calls himself chiefest of "stulti, stolidi, fatui, fungi, bardi, blenni, *buccones.*" The word *bucco* must have reminded the audience of Bucco in the *Fabulae Atellanae* (see, e.g., Smith, *Dictionary of Antiquities*[3], I, 522 B; Teuffel-Wahr, § 9; *Thesaurus, s.v.* "Bucco").

Part of Plautus' name, Maccus, is a reminder of the *Fabulae Atellanae*. Plautus gives his name in several passages in the prologues, chiefly in statements about the Greek originals of his plays. Cf. *As.* 10–12;[2] *Mer.* 9–10. For the name Plautus see further

---

[1] We know that Roman audiences were keen to relate things in the plays to actual life. Cf., e.g., Suetonius *Iul.* 84 (the account of Caesar's funeral); Macrobius *Sat.* ii. 7. 4–5 (Caesar and Decimus Laberius); F. F. Abbott, "The Theatre as a Factor in Roman Politics under the Republic" (pp. 100–14 of his *Society and Politics in Ancient Rome*).

[2] Leo (p. 200) regards this passage as Plautine. Leo and Lindsay read *Maccus;* Ritschl read *Maccius.* Leo (pp. 81–85) regards Maccus as a "Beiname," which Plautus won as "Schauspieler . . . . ; Varros *in operis artificum scaenicorum* [ap. Gell. 3. 3. 14] erhält also eine tatsächliche Bestätigung." He believes, then, that Plautus had acted "in der italischen Volksposse als Atellanenspieler" (85). Finally, he sees in Horace (Epp. ii. 1. 173), "aspice, Plautus . . . . quantus sit Dossennus edacibus in parasitis," a reference to this part of Plautus' career.

In several other passages Plautus may have been thinking of himself. In *As.* 127 ff., Argyrippus adulescens complains bitterly of the treatment accorded to him

*Cas.* 32–34.[1]   This passage Leo (p. 207, n. 2) regards as from Plautus' hand.   The adjective *Plautinus* occurs in *Ps.*, Prol. 2; *Cas.*, Prol. 12 (for references in Terence to Plautus see below, p. 53).

Other passages in which reference is made to the Greek originals of Plautus' plays are *Mi.* 85–87; *Poe.* 53–54; *Tr.* 18–19.

One most important reference to the contemporary drama is the famous passage *Mi.* 209–13, which refers to the imprisonment of Naevius.   On this see F. D. Allen, *Harvard Studies*, VII, 37–64; Brix-Niemeyer[2], *ad loc.*   Leo (*Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, I, 78) accepts the tradition of Naevius' imprisonment.   I may refer here to my suggestion (*Classical Philology*, XII, 149, n. 2) that Plautus, in his use of *poeta*, was, at times at least, parodying Naevius' proud application of the term to himself.

In *As.* 746 ff. Professor Sihler (*AJP*, XXVI, 4) saw the earliest contemporary allusion to the *Collegium Poetarum*.   But see my remarks in *Classical Philology*, XII, 149, n. 2.

Plautus once significantly mentions Philemon and Diphilus together in the body of a play, *Mo.* 1149 ff. (quoted above, p. 37). For Diphilus see also *Cas.*, Prol. 32; *Ru.*, Prol. 32; for Philemon see *Tr.*, Prol. 19; *Mer.* 9 (not formally a prologue).

That Terence in his prologues names some of his predecessors in the Roman drama, and refers to a contemporary whom he does not name is well known.   He names also the authors of his Greek originals.

Let us begin with the latter.   In *An.* 9 he names Menander as author of an *Andria* and a *Perinthia*, from both of which he had drawn materials for his own *Andria*.   He passes to a vigorous defense of *contaminatio* (18–21).   In *Eu.* 19–21 he again names

by Cleareta lena.   In 134–35 he cries: "Nam mare haud est mare, vos mare acer-rumum, nam in mari repperi, hic elavi bonis."   This makes one think (did it make the audience think ?) of the facts of Plautus' life, as told by Gellius (iii. 3. 14): "plerique alii [i.e., other than Varro] memoriae tradiderunt, cum [Plautus], pecunia omni quam in operis artificum scaenicorum pepererat in mercatibus perdita, inops Romam redisset . . . ."   In *Tr.* 330–32 Philto senex, questioning his son about the cause of Lesbonicus' 'poverty,' asks: "Publicisne adfinis fuit an maritumis negotiis ?   Merca-turan an venalis habuit ubi rem perdidit ?"   See Gray on *As.* 130 ff., and for skepti-cism with respect to Gellius' account Leo, pp. 70–73.

   *Mo.* 770: "Quid ? Sarsinatis ecqua est, si Umbram non habes ?" makes one recall the tradition that Plautus was born at Sarsina (see Leo, p. 81).

   [1] On the name Plautus see Leo, pp. 81–85.

Menander as his source (see *Fabia* on *Eu.* 3, and *Les Prologues de Terence*, p. 115).  In *Eu.* 22 ff. he defends himself against the charge of *contaminatio,* which now took the form that he had transferred to his *Eunuchus* matter borrowed from the *Colax* of Naevius and the *Colax* of Plautus (*furtum*, 'plagiarism').  In *Ph.* 24–29 he names the Greek original of this play but does not name the author; he explains also why he changes the name of his play to *Phormio.*

*Ad.* 6–11 is interesting, as giving the ethics of playwriting in Terence' day: see especially, 9–11:

> eum Plautus locum
> reliquit integrum.   Eum hic locum sumpsit sibi
> in Adelphos, verbum de verbo expressum extulit.

In *Hau.* 7–9 Terence says:

> Nunc qui scripserit
> et quoia Graeca sit, ni partem maxumam
> existumarem scire vostrum, id dicerem.

The audience may have had this information through the *pronuntiatio tituli,* which preceded the performance (see Ballenden on *Hau.* 7, and the next paragraph of this paper).

Several times Terence insists that his play is *nova* (*An.*, Prol. 26–27 [by implication]; *Ad.*, Prol. 12; *Hau.*, Prol. 7, 29, 34, 43; *Hec.*, Prol. 2, 5; *Ph.*, Prol. 24).  On the other hand the prologue to the *Andria* gives evidence that this play (and other plays?) of Terence had been produced before the performance of the *Andria* for which the extant prologue to that play was written (see Fairclough, *Andria*, p. 70; Ashmore, *Terence*, Introduction, § 47, pp. 29–30).

From *Hau.*, Prol. 4–5, we see that it was a point in favor of a play if it was based on a Greek original not previously adapted.

In the reference to *contaminatio* (see above, pp. 52–53) we have echoes of the quarrel that Terence had with a certain *malivolus vetus poeta,* identified by scholars with Luscius Lanuvinus.  See further *An.*, Prol. 1–23 (the plural in 8, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, need not imply that Terence had more than one critic in mind; in 8 the plural closely follows the specific reference to *malivolus vetus poeta,* 7. Elsewhere Terence very definitely has one rival in mind).  In *Hau.*, Prol. 16 ff. the famous actor, L. Ambivius Turpio, elaborately defends Terence against the charge of having spoiled many Greek plays to

make a few Latin plays; the charge is made now (16) by *rumores
. . . . malivoli.* Then the *malivolus vetus poeta* appears again, to
charge Terence with having taken up the drama without sufficient
preparation, *amicum ingenio fretum, haud natura sua* (24). In
reply Terence sharply condemns a recent play of his critic (31 ff.).
In *Eu.*, Prol. 4–6, Terence maintains that he had assailed his adver-
sary only because the other had attacked him first, and that he was
therefore justified in his rejoinders; the other has flaws enough of
his own to correct (7–12). In 14–19 he declares that he can pick
many other flaws in his adversary's work, *si is perget laedere.* In
*Ph.*, Prol. 1–11, Luscius is bidden to look at the beam in his own eye,
and Terence declares that the quarrel has been entirely of Luscius'
seeking (12–23). In *Ad.*, Prol. 2, there is reference to *iniqui et
advorsarii;* in 15 there is allusion to *malivoli,* who assert that
"homines nobilis hunc adiutare adsidueque una scribere." To the
latter charge Terence makes no real answer, merely saying that he
counts it honor supreme to please such men (17–25).

In *Hec.*, Prol. 11–14, Ambivius Turpio names Caecilius. Having
noted the failure of Caecilius' earlier plays, he tells how he persisted
in bringing those plays on again; "ubi sunt cognitae [through
Ambivius's skill], placitae sunt" (21–22). Terence explains (*An.*,
Prol. 1–7) that the assaults of his critics have prevented him from
using the prologue for its proper purpose. The prologues of the
*Hecyra* show the difficulties confronting the man who sought success
as a playwright, e.g., the populace preferred (28–42) *pugiles, funam-
buli, gladiatores,* to comedies.

Part of the quarrel between Terence and Luscius had to do with
the question whether the translations or adaptations of Greek plays
should be close or free; cf. *An.*, Prol. 18–21.

The difference between the *fabula stataria* and the *fabula motoria*
is brought out by Ambivius in *Hau.*, Prol. 35–45: the former is
*lenis* (45), the latter *laboriosa* (44). We learn, too, that Terence'
purpose has been to please the people, the good among them (*An.*,
Prol. 1 ff.; *Eu.*, Prol. 1–3); he disavows intention to libel (*laedere*)
anyone (*Eu.*, Prol. 1–6).

In *Eu.*, Prol. 22–41, in defending himself against the charge of
plagiarism, he writes the famous words: "nullumst iam dictum, quod

non sit dictum prius." He was obliged even to defend his style (*Ph.*, Prol. 4–11). He admits frankly that some of his plays had been, at first, unsuccessful: *Ph.*, Prol. 30–34 and the prologues to the *Hecyra, passim.*

Terence, too, found it necessary to appeal for silence: *An.*, Prol. 24–27; *Eu.*, Prol. 44–45; *Hecyra*, prologues, *passim*, but especially 28–57.

Though Terence names no actor or dancer in the body of any of his plays, being in this respect, as in so many others, more artistic than Plautus, we may note that the prologues to the *Hauton* and the *Hecyra* were delivered by L. Ambivius Turpio. From what Terence makes Ambivius say we learn much. Usually the prologue was spoken by a young actor (*Hau.*, Prol. 1–3). From *Hau.*, Prol. 1–3, 35–45, especially 43, and *Hec.* 10–13, we see that Ambivius was well on in years. He spoke these prologues as *actor, orator,* 'pleader,' 'attorney,' for Terence; his popularity and influence were thus thrown into the scales on the side of Terence against Luscius (*Hau.*, Prol. 10–27; *Hec.*, Prol. 9–57). Ambivius had, when younger, produced the plays of Caecilius (see above, p. 54). He deals with the charges against Terence, *contaminatio, furtum,* etc. He distinguishes the *fabula stataria* from the *fabula motoria* (see above, p. 54). He throws light on the stock rôles of comedy: *Eu.*, Prol. 26, 30–31, 35–41; *Hau.* 35–40 (see above, p. 43).

I am reserving for another paper the passages in which, I think, Plautus had particular Greek or Latin authors in mind.

BARNARD COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

# THE NUMBER THREE, MYSTERIOUS, MYSTIC, MAGIC[1]

### By Emory B. Lease

The student of the classics is early confronted with the number 3 and its occult meaning. Before he has finished the first book of Caesar (*B.G.* i. 53. 7) he encounters "thrice were the lots consulted," and a little later he finds in Vergil (*Aen.* i. 265) that Aeneas ruled 3 years, Ascanius 30, the Alban kings 300, all significant numbers with a significant total, 333. Advancing a little farther in his reading, he comes face to face with 333, $333\frac{1}{3}$ brass pieces,[2] the cost of the games that were vowed to the gods in order to appease their anger (Livy xxii. 10. 7); and, turning to other countries, he finds that the Japanese had erected an image to the goddess Kwannon (in origin a Buddhist deity), an image decorated with 33,333 smaller images.[3] These numbers are startling. But a far more marked determination to glorify the number 3 is shown by the church at Lambach, built in a triangular[4] form, with 3 towers, 3 windows, 3 doors, 3 façades, 3 organs, 3 altars in marble of 3 different colors, 3 sacristies costing 333,333 florins, and dedicated to the Trinity.[5] Obviously chance plays no part here. Manifestly the number 3 was not selected for its numerical value. To seek for the key that unlocks this mystery, as well as other similar ones, is the aim of the present inquiry.

Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.

From time to time in the history of the world various numbers, chiefly those from 1 to 12, have been regarded as possessing a mystical significance, but there can be no doubt that in the extent, variety,

---

[1] Three important authorities are to be referred to: Usener, "Die Dreiheit," *Rhein. Mus.*, LVIII (1903), appropriately appearing in three parts (pp. 1–55; 161–208; 320–62); Wundt, *Völkerpsychologie* (1909), II, 3, pp. 530 f.; and Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1915), 12 vols. As early as 1618 a treatise appeared, "Petri Bungi," *Numerorum Mysteria*, of almost 100 pages.

[2] Cf. Lease, *Livy* (1914), notes to i. 1107; xxii. 356.

[3] Cf. *Dict. of Non-Class. Mythol.* (Everyman's Library), p. 106.

[4] For the significance of the triangle cf. p. 71 *infra*.

[5] Arthur Gaye, *National Review*, XXI (1893), 209 (or *The Living Age*, CXCVII, 666 f.).

and frequency of its use the number 3 far surpasses all the rest.[1]
The word "three," itself, shows a threefold use: one definite, its
actual intrinsic value; another, symbolic, mystic, esoteric; the third,
indefinite, of an indeterminate number of times, even in the sense
of "many."   The study of the symbolic 3 takes us back to a remote
antiquity, into the realms of mythology, religion, mathematics,
philosophy, and magic—in fact, into almost every province of
knowledge, to many and diverse lands, to peoples civilized and un-
civilized, and to nations both ancient and modern.[2]   Of its use may
well be said:

> Mobilitate viget virisque adquirit eundo:
> Parva metu primo, mox sese attollit in auras
> Ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit.

So vast is the field of inquiry, so numerous the manifestations,
that only a *spicilegium* can be presented.

In the first[3] systematic classification of the gods of ancient Greece,
in Hesiod's *Theogony*, we already find numerous groupings of the
gods by triads, or trinities (Eusener cites 15 Hesiodic trinities and
41 others).   This trichotomous tendency also manifested itself in

---

[1] "Wie fast bei allen Völkern, spielt auch bei den Germanen die Dreizahl im
Leben, in der Religion, in der Dichtung von allen Zahlen die wichtigste Rolle."—
J. Hoops, *Real-lexikon d. Germ. Alt.*, I (1910–13), 487.

[2] Cf., e.g., William J. Locke, *The Wonderful Year* (1916), p. 23: Fontibras, the
philosopher, on being asked why, after holding a lighted match to the cigarettes of his
two friends, he blew it out and used another to light his own, replied: "It arises out
of the Russian funeral ritual in which the three altar candles are lit by the same taper.
To apply the same method of illumination to three worldly things like cigars or cigar-
ettes is regarded as an act of impiety and hence as unlucky."   The impressive ritualis-
tic observances, a threefold query and response, before the portals of the crypt would
be opened to admit the body of the emperor, Francis Joseph (November 27, 1916),
may also be noted.   Cf. also "Trench Superstitions," *Literary Digest* (May 19, 1917),
p. 1550.   According to *Life* (May 5, 1917), "It looked bad when the fire-alarm went off
three times while the minister was preaching Wildway's funeral sermon."

[3] It is to be noted, however, that already in the Orphic theogony, there is not only a
trinity of gods (Metis, Phanes, Erikepaios), but also a Chronos with 3 heads, that the
Curetes were 3 in number, and that there was a triad of the elements (fire, water, earth).
For the "*triplex Cosmogonia inscripta*," cf. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* I, pp. 482 f., and
note that in the Homeric hymn the caduceus of Hermes is represented as a "golden
rod, three petaled."   Cf. also Reinach, *Orpheus* (1909), p. 33: "the idea of a divine
trinity is much earlier than Christianity, for we find that several of the Babylonian
deities were grouped in triads, as of Anu, Bel, and Ea, the gods of Heaven, the Earth,
and the Waters," and p. 27, in Egypt, "at an early date the divine personages Horus,
Ra, and Osiris stand out of the swarm of local deities."   For the three cosmic divinities
composing the supreme triad of the Mithraic Pantheon, see Franz Cumont, *The
Mysteries of Mithra* (1910), pp. 109 f.

assigning triads of children to the gods, as to Kronos and Rhea 3
sons[1] (Zeus, Poseidon, Hades) and 3 daughters (Hestia, Demeter,
Hera); 3 sons to Zeus and Hera; 3 sons to Ares and Aphrodite, etc.
The triadic conception also gave rise to the tradition that there
were 3 cyclops, 3 Gorgons, 3 Moirae,[2] 3 Erinyes, 3 Charites,[3] 3
judges of the Lower World, etc., as well as to the custom of offering
prayers to triads of gods, as, in Sophocles (O.T. 159), to Athena,
Artemis, Apollo (Eusener cites 17 such triads), and in the taking of
oaths[4] (Eusener cites 17 such triads, and says that a similar custom
prevailed among the Macedonians, Thracians, and Phrygians).
A further development in the conception of the triad, and an impor-
tant one, is marked by the combination of three bodies into one,
the "three in one" idea, as in the goddess Hecate,[5] the fabulous
monster Chimaera, Geryon, etc., and by the triplication of certain
parts of the body, as in the representation of Zeus Herkeios with
3 eyes[6] (one being in the forehead), of Hermes, Cerberus,[7] of the
Hydra (originally) with 3 heads,[8] the dragon of Colchis with 3
tongues, each 3-forked (according to Prudentius, Cath., III, 128);
the serpent in Eden had colla trilinguia, and (Ham. 202 a linguam
trisulcam). So also the serpent of Ares had not only 3 tongues,

[1] An important trinity, and with parallels in other mythologies, as to them was
assigned the triple division of the cosmos into the sky, the sea, and the underworld.
Cf. Homer, Il. xv. 189, τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται. Cf. also the Homeric hymn 16. 7
and Preller, Gr. Myth.[1], pp. 86 f.

[2] Compare the 3 Parcae of the Romans, the 3 Norns, guardians of destiny, of the
Scandinavian mythology, and "the Sisters Three" of Shakespeare.

[3] Cf. Sen. Ben. i. 32 tres Gratiae, sorores, manibus inplexis, etc.

[4] Cf. Τρίτατος δ' Ἀίδης, a very sacred form of oath. Cf. also Richard M. Meyer,
Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte (1910), p. 176: "Alt scheint (wie bei den Hellenen)
die Dreizahl der 'Schwurgötter': Thor, Odin, Frey. wie denn auch sonst (wie überall)
Triaden begegnen"; p. 634: "927 n. Chr. alte islandische Eidformel (Frey, Njord,
Thor)." Note also Reinach, loc. cit., p. 118: "the triad, Sky, Earth, and Sea, is used
in the formula of a Celtic oath." Cf. also p. 65 infra.

[5] Cf. Ovid Metamorph. vii. 94, triformis Hecate; Sen. Agam. 841, triformis Geryon;
Hor. C. i. 27. 23, triformis Chimaera, and Milton, "Goddess Triform, I own thy triple
spell"; Swinburne, "Being treble in thy divided deity."

[6] Sicily, too, had a 3-eyed cyclops. Cf. Folk-Lore, XVI, p. 276.

[7] Cf. Shakespeare: "Cerberus, that three headed canis," and "you are not like
Cerberus, three gentlemen at once, are you?"

[8] Compare also the Slav god, Triglav, and cf. Reinach, op. cit., p. 145. According
to p. 118 the Celts also had a three-headed god. For the Thriae, the three nymphs,
"discoverers of the three magic counters," cf. Robbins, Class. Phil., XI (1916), p. 287.

but 3 rows of teeth (Ovid *Metamorph*. iii. 34; Stat. *Theb*. v. 509; Val. Flacc. ii. 500); Zeus' thunderbolt was trifurcated;[1] not only Hercules' club (Ovid *Fasti* i. 575, but also the club of Theseus (*Her*. iv. 115)) was 3-knotted, and last, but not least, is to be cited the sacred tripod[2] of the priestess of Apollo at Delphi.   So also the Aloidae, when 3×3 years of age were 3×3 cubits in width and 3×3×3 cubits in height.   Note also the threefold distribution in the early account of the fall of Troy into preparation, siege, and wanderings, each lasting a decade (Grote, *Hist. Gr*., I, 269), that Hector's body was thrice dragged round the walls of Troy (Verg. *Aen*. i. 483; Prop. iii. 2. 28), that Helenus told Odysseus that to take Troy 3 things were necessary (assistance of Neoptolemus, bow and arrows of Heracles, the possession of the Palladium), that the Maenads were divided into 3 bands,[3] that there were 3 varieties of the dramatic chorus of Dionysus, as well as 3 principal Doric choruses, that the tragic art of Athens, as also the comic, had its 3 great representatives, that the idea of a trilogy was introduced by Aeschylus, the "three unities" by Aristotle.   Furthermore, "the Attic theatre never, in its most palmy days, exceeded three solo actors" (Freytag, *Tech. of the Drama*, p. 148), Aristotle's *Rhetoric*[4] consisted of 3 books, and there were 3 kinds of oratory, 3 schools of rhetoric (Cic. *Inv*. ii. 6 f.; Quint. iii. 1. 8 f.), according to Varro, "*tria Theologiae genera*," a threefold division of daylight and a threefold division of darkness, as also of the month, besides a sacrifice of 3 animals (the Τριττύς), sacrifices 3 days after the funeral (the Τρίτα), a triple offering to the dead, of honey, milk, and wine (Soph. *Antig*. 431), etc.[5]   But *satis superque*.

Turning to Italy, we find here also illustrations in perplexing profusion.   An interesting use is found in Plautus (*Pseud*. 704 f.),

[1] Ovid *Metamorph*. ii. 325.   According to Servius (*ad Aen*. ii. 649) there were three kinds of lightning (*quod adflat, quod incendit, quod findit*) and (*ad* viii. 429) a *triplex potestas fluminis* (*ostentatorium, peremptiorium, praesagum*).

[2] Cf. Placidus to Stat. *Theb*. i. 509, "tripos species est lauri, tres habens radices, Apollini consecrata, propter vim triplicem divinationis.   Nam et Sol · praeterita vidit et praesentia cernit et futura visurus est."   According to Ausonius (*Griph*. 74) "Orpheus huic tripoda, quia sunt tria, terra, aqua, flamma."

[3] Cf. Eurip. *Bacch*. 680 f.; Prop. iii. 17. 24.

[4] Tripartite divisions of a topic are frequent in rhetoric, as may be seen from Marx's Index to *Auct. Her*. (29 such triads).

[5] Cf. further, Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 287; Buttmann, *Mythologus*, I, 29; Gerhard, *Gr. Myth*, I, 141, and Whibley, *Comp. to Gk. Stud*., pp. 502, 503, 507.

where that "Artful Dodger," before presenting a letter, says: "I am
seeking the one to whom I am to impart delights *thrice three, threefold*,
acquired by *three* ruses from *three* persons." But long before the
time of Plautus, even before the founding of the city, Evander had
to fight with one who was endowed with 3 lives and was therefore
obliged to kill him 3 times (Verg. *Aen.* viii. 56), and Hercules had to
thrice smite the robber, Cacus, who had 3 heads (Prop. iv. 9, 10).
The reign of Romulus saw an amalgamation of 3 cantons into a single
community, and even as early as this the *Fratres Arvales*[1] were in
existence, a priesthood whose membership was composed of a multiple
of 3 and who celebrated the festival to the goddess *Dea Dia* with
a threefold repetition of the first part of their chant. By the time
of Numa there was already a trinity[2] of gods (Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus)
with three *Flamines Maiores* consecrated to their service, and a priest-
hood, the *Salii*, who worshiped this trinity with a "3 step" (cf.
Hor. *C.* iv. 1. 28, *ter quatient humum*). During the reign of the
third king, the combat between the Roman triplets, the *Horatii*, and
the Alban triplets, the *Curiatii*, took place, during Servius' reign
the triple sacrifice, the *Suovetaurilia*[3] (cf. the Τριττύς) was offered,
and when Rome's last king was banished the person who presided
over the elections for the consuls had the significant surname, *Trici-
pitinus* (cf. Livy i. 59. 8). It was about this time that the older
trinity was superseded by the great trinity of the Romans, the
Capitoline Triad[4] (Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva), and in 493 B.C.[5]
that the Greek triad (Demeter, Dionysus, Kore) was introduced into
Italy. Furthermore, there were *Tres Fortunae, Tria Fata*,[6] 3 Parcae,
a festival, the *Ambarvalia*, lasting 3 days, a college of pontifices,
augurs, and of the *Epulones*, each consisting originally of 3 members,

---

[1] Cf. Lease, *Livy* (1914), note to i. 125.

[2] According to Wissowa, *Rel. u. Kunst*[2] (1912), p. 23, the Umbrians also had a
trinity, Juppiter, Mars, and Vofionus.

[3] Cf. Cato *Agr.* 141, and Lease, *Livy* (1914), note to i, 1579.

[4] This triad, it may be noted, the greatest and most highly honored by the
Romans, was composed of two women to one man. Of the 75 trinities of the Greeks
cited by Eusener, 14 were so constituted, and 5 were entirely composed of women.

[5] Cf. Wissowa, *loc. cit.*, p. 51.

[6] Cf. Wissowa, *loc. cit.*, pp. 261 and 264.

and a cult of *Liber, Ceres, Libera*.[1]  Note also Placidus, to Stat. *Theb.* i. 108: "*trium* Furiarum *tres* memorat potestates: sitis, morbi, famesque"; and to iii. 511: "Proserpinam . . . . e malo punico gustasse *tria* grana."  A few more illustrations may also be noted: the fact that there were 3 principal assemblies of the people, a triple line of battle, a triple division of the month (as among the Greeks), *tria nomina* (the characteristic of a *liber homo*), the *triclinium* with its 3 couches and 3 places on each, and the Roman custom, as also of the Greeks, of eating 3 meals a day.

The number 3 plays a prominent part in ritualistic observances,[2] as when the priest, as an act of ceremonial purification, thrice sprinkles the mourners with pure water (Verg. *Aen.* vi. 229), and when the pious Aeneas thrice invokes the departed spirit of his friend, Deiphobus (*ibid.*, 506).  Similarly, the enchantress, Medea, "thrice purifies Jason with fire, thrice with water, and thrice with sulphur" (Ovid *Metamorph.* viii. 261).[3]  But perhaps the most remarkable glorification of the number 3 is to be found in the celebration of the *Ludi Speculares* in 17 B.C., with expiatory rites lasting 3 nights and 3 days, the ceremonies opening with a sacrifice by Augustus of 3×3 kids and 3×3 lambs on 3 different altars and ending on the 3d day of June.  The festival proper was preceded by 3 days of purification, followed by 3 expiatory offerings of 3 different kinds, and concluded with a poem by Horace, sung by 3×3×3 boys and 3×3×3 girls.  The 3 nights were dedicated to 3 divinities, so the 3 days; 3×3×3 cakes of 3 different kinds were thrice offered, and on the 3d night 3 sacrifices were made.  With this use of 3 at a pagan festival may be compared its use in the great church hymn,

[1] A Greek triad, in origin.  Cf. Cic. *N.D.* ii. 62.  The worship of this triad lasted for over 285 years, a temple being dedicated to their worship in 449 B.C., silver statues being erected to them in 197, and prayers offered in their temple in 174 (Livy iii. 55. 7; xxiii. 25. 7; xli. 28. 2).

[2] As early as Rome's third king expiatory rites were celebrated for 3×3 days (Livy i. 31. 4).  For the other *Novendiale* cf. Porphyr. to Hor. *Ep.* xvii. 48: *nam novendiale dicitur sacrificium, quod mortuo fit nona die, qua sepultus est.*  The ritualistic 3 was also common in the Germanic realm: "Alles, was im altern Ritual wurzelt, muss dreimal geschehen. . . . . Nur wenn es dreimal geschieht, hat man Erfolg erwartet."—J. Hoops, *loc. cit.*

[3] Cf. Soph. *Antig.* 431, and Verg. *Aen.* ix. 329; xi. 188; Horace *Ep.* i. 1. 37; C. iii. 22. 3; Ovid *Metamorph.* iv. 753; *Fast.* ii. 572; iii. 563; vi. 155, 753; Tib. i. 5. 14; iii. 12. 14; Stat. *Theb.* iv. 465, etc.

the *Dies Irae*, composed of 3×3×3 stanzas, each consisting of 3 verses and a triple rhyme. Triple repetition of the same act is also observed in the consultation of lots, as in Caes. *B.G.* i. 53. 7; Tib. i. 3. 11; Tac. *Germ.* 10, etc., and in the triple clapping of hands to indicate approval, or in cheering, as in Hor. *C.* ii. 17. 26; Prop. iii. 10.4; Mart. iii. 46. 8, etc. Cf. "to give three cheers."

Turning to matters far remote, we find the same tendency manifesting itself in the bibulous realm (cf. "three sheets in the wind"): in drinking the law (a *mystica lex*, Auson. *Gryph.*) was to drain 3 glasses or 3×3 (Hor. *C.* iii. 19. 11; Petron. 136).

In charms also the number 3 was considered to be of great potency. This particular variety may therefore be denominated the Therapeutic 3. The field is so large that a few illustrations will have to suffice. It is interesting to note that no less a person than the great Caesar, "as soon as he had taken his seat in the carriage, was accustomed to repeat a certain formula 3 times in order to secure safety in his journey" (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* xxviii. 21). So also the enchantress, Medea, indulges in a 3-fold incantation in order to put to sleep the dragon of the 3-forked tongue, and, as a preliminary step to invoking divine aid, "3 nights before the full moon thrice turns about and thrice sprinkles water on her head before crying out a 3-fold supplication to Hecate of the 3 forms (Ovid *Metamorph.* vii. 153; 190). No less interesting is the account in Vergil (*Ecl.* viii. 74 f.) of the means resorted to by the shepherdess to rekindle the fire of love in the heart of one whose ardor had lost some of its fervor: she first twines 3 threads of 3 different hues round the wax image which she had made of her lover, and then carries it 3 times round the altar. Her maid assists by making 3 love-knots of the 3 threads. (Cf. also Prop. iv. 6. 7; p. 65 *infra*.) Tibullus acting on this principle enjoins his ladylove to "chant the love-charm thrice and spit[1] thrice when the spell is done" (i. 2. 54; cf. also Petron. 131). This spitting feature is a common element in many climes. In *Folk-Lore*, IV, 63, we are told that "to this day in India, when women see a falling star they spit thrice to scare the demon." But

---

[1] Cf. Nicholson, "The Saliva Superstition," *Harv. Stud.*, VIII (1897); Grendon, "Anglo-Saxon Charms," *Journ. Am. Folk-Lore*, XXII (1909), 105–227; Wuttke, *Der deutsche Volksaberglaube* (1860), p. 138, etc., and Eugene Tavenner, "Three as a Magic Number in Latin Literature," *Trans. Am. Phil. Assn.*, XLVII (1916), 117 f.

we are not without illustrations from nearer home.   In cosmopolitan New York City it is a not uncommon custom for certain small boys, whenever they see a dead animal lying in the street, to spit 3 times in order not to "eat it on their bread for supper," or, in case a foreign object gets into the eye, to lift the eyelid and spit 3 times.   Ben Jonson, it should be noted here, says "Spit three times for luck" (*Epig.* 134).   Pliny is our authority (*N.H.* xxviii. 36) for the statement that "it was customary to spit on the ground 3 times after taking a dose of medicine" to insure its efficacy (cf. also xxiv, 172 and 181).   While the scientist might justify this measure on the ground of psychological therapeutics, he could hardly do so in this remedy for boils: "spit 3 times on them when they first appear"; or in the following, which Pliny prudently introduces by "they say"; "if any one while washing his feet will touch his eyes 3 times with the water, he will be free from all diseases and ailments of the eye" (§ 44). To be cured of the gout was not so simple, as we learn from Varro (*R.R.* i. 2. 27) that one must chant a certain formula $3 \times 3 \times 3$ times and with every time spit.

> Cetera de genere hoc, adeo sunt multa, loquacem
> Delassare valent Fabium.

These uses of the number 3 can be more easily understood and appreciated when studied in the light of the usage of other nations. Furthermore, a similarity in usage shows the homogeneity of the human mind.   As there were trinities in the classical world, so also we find them in India, where the great Hindu trinity, the Trimurti (Brahma, Siva, Vishnu), three deities worshiped collectively, is best known.   Each god had 3 incarnations, those of Vishnu being connected with the Deluge (Max Mueller, *India*, p. 144) and "Vishnu's Three Strides" covering the heavens was a tale oft told.   It is interesting also to note that Siva's emblem, like Poseidon's, was a trident,[1] and that the Hindu priest, as the last step to render the victim sacred, thrice turns round it with a lighted torch.   But Buddhism went still farther: "out of the five last Buddhas of the earlier teaching there grew up five mystic trinities" (*Ency. Brit.*[11], XVI, 97).   There was also a trinity of Vedic gods (Agni, Indra,

[1] For the *trisula* of the Buddhists cf. Thomas Wilson, *The Swastika* (1896), pp. 962 f.

Surya).   And Babylon had two divine triads, Egypt many, the chief
being that composed of Osiris, Isis, and Horus.   The triadic system
was also a prominent feature in the religion of the Chaldeans, Mon-
golians, Phrygians, and Scythians.   According to Herodotus (viii.
137) "the first man of the Scythians was a son of Zeus and had 3
sons."   The multiple of 3 appears in the Zend Avesta (Spiegel, III,
p. lxix), where we are told that Ahriman produced 99,999 diseases,
and that one of the gods had a bodyguard of 99,999 *fravashi*.[1]   It
is also to be noted that the triplicity of the cosmos (heaven, earth,
water), found in classic realms, is also a feature of the Japanese
doctrine, Taoism, each realm having its own special ruler, and, to
go no farther, we may note the great Germanic triad,[2] Wodan,
Thorr, and Donar.   Tacitus' statement (*Germ.* 2) is peculiarly
interesting, to the effect that the primitive man, Mannus, had
3 sons and from these sprang the three main tribes of Germany,
with which may be compared the account in Genesis (9:19): "Of
Noah's three sons was the whole earth overspread."   Somewhat
different is the account that the first man in the Isle of Man had 3
legs (*Folk-Lore*, XVII, 469), and it was on a horse who had 3 legs that
the Scandinavian goddess of the dead, Hel, first appeared on earth.[3]
According to the Gaelic account of the Argonautic expedition, there
were 3 Argonauts who changed themselves into 3 hawks and by
this means were successful in securing 3 of the apples of the Hes-
perides, in spite of the fact that the 3 daughters of the king had
transformed themselves into 3 ospreys and pursued them.[4]

In the realm of folklore the number 3 was particularly prolific,
manifesting itself in the triple repetition of the same act.   The
illustrations from all lands are so numerous that only an abbreviated

---

[1] For its use in the Germanic realm cf. Meyer, *loc. cit.:* "Neun ist Odins Zahl."

[2] The earliest triad consisted of Ingo, Irmin, and Isto, the "drei urgermanische
Hauptgötter" (the Mercurius, Mars, Hercules, of Tac. *Germ.* 9).—R. M. Meyer,
*loc. cit.*, pp. 195.  Cf. also p. 530: "die Dreizahl ist Lieblingszahl," and the "litera-
ture" there cited; also J. Hoops, *loc. cit.*  It is interesting to note that the family
motto of Bismarck was "In Trinitate Robur," the arms a clover leaf and 3 oak leaves,
and that contemporary caricature pictures him with 3 hairs on his head.

[3] Note also the Scandinavian Tree of Life, the Yggdrasil, with its 3 roots going
down to 3 realms.

[4] For the Celtic fondness for triads cf. Charles Squire's *Celtic Myths and Legends.*
Cf. also Grendon, "Anglo-Saxon Charms," *loc. cit.*

selection is possible. From Clare, Ireland, comes the interesting remedy for removing warts: "rub a stolen scrap of meat three times round each wart in the name of each person of the Trinity," a curious mixture of pagan mysticism and modern Christianity.[1]   An interesting parallel to the custom referred to by Vergil (viii. 78 f.) is recorded by Frazer (III, 304): threads with 3 knots are still used in Argyleshire to cure internal ailments of man or beast, and Highland sorcerers use 3 strings of 3 different colors with 3 knots in each as a charm against the evil eye (VI, 154); and a parallel to the Roman *Ambarvalia* is cited from Dahomey, Africa, where the custom prevailed "of every three years carrying around the city the serpent god, Danbe, to rid its inhabitants of their ills and ailments" (*Folk-Lore*, XVIII, 268).

In oaths and vows[2] (though differing in ethical value, alike in this respect) the tendency to indulge in "threes" is also marked. In India, e.g., it is the regular custom to emphasize both oaths and vows by repeating them 3 times (*Folk-Lore* X, 410), and Usener (p. 45) says that "from his earliest youth he has heard Catholics when greatly excited cry out 'Jesus, Maria, Josef,'" and adds "we curse 'in drei Teuffels Namen.'"

To change the scene. St. Augustine (*Epist.* lv [ii. p. 141, M.]) says: "ternarius numerus in multis sacramentis excellit." Illustrations are numerous, as, e.g., in the ceremonial at the death of a pope, when a representative of the Sacred College strikes the forehead of the dead pope 3 times with a silver mallet (cf. further the *Cath. Encycl.*, *s.v.* "Triduum" and "Novena"). A striking use of the number 3 is shown in the blessing of the water on the eve of the

---

[1] *Folk-Lore*, XXII, 571. Compare the Anglo-Saxon charm (*op. cit.*, p. 187) for recovering stolen cattle: "pray three times toward the East and say thrice *Crux Christi ab oriente reducat*" and similarly toward each point of the compass; to remove a strange swelling: "sing the Paternoster three times and say *Fuge, diabolus, Christus te sequitur*," and repeat again this formula three times; and (p. 199), a charm against infectious diseases: "over the patient sing three times *Matheus me ducat, Marcus me conservet, Lucas me liberet, Johannes me adiuvet, semper, Amen*," etc.   For an illustration nearer home compare Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn* (chap. i) "to keep witches away I got up and turned around in my tracks three times and crossed my breast every time."   Cf. also *Folk-Lore*, XVII, 70; XIX, 315, 434, 456; XX, 77, 346; XXII, 345, 474; XXIII, 191; Frazer, *loc. cit.*, VII, 198; XI, 180, 184; Wuttke, *loc. cit.*; Henry Williams, *Curious Facts*, pp. 69, 139, 150, 197, 318, and Lease, *Livy* (1914), p. 216, note.

[2] Cf. also Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, p. 740, and p. 58 *supra*.

Epiphany (cf. Eusener, p. 2 and note; also pp. 36–46; 180–83).
Here another modern illustration may be noted, the *Angelus*, a
devotion consisting of 3 scriptural texts, recited 3 times a day,
the bell (often 3, each tolling 3 times) tolling 3 times daily, 3 strokes
each time; and the Catholic doctrine of a threefold division of the
hereafter (heaven, hell, purgatory); compare also Dante's concep-
tion. According to Reinach (*op. cit.*, p. 387) "the Trinity of the
Jesuits, expressed by JMJ (Jesus, Mary, Joseph) has practically
superseded the other." As a striking illustration of the fact that the
number 3 "mobilitate viget virisque adquirit eundo" may be cited
the tenet of Pseudo-Dionysus (Areopagiticus) of the fifth century,
maintaining that there are three triads of the celestial hierarchy
between the Triune God and man, with a corresponding three triads of
the ecclesiastical hierarchy between Jesus and man, and the Jewish
system of theosophy, prevalent in the tenth century and later, the
Cabala, with its three triads subdivided into trinities. Biblical
illustrations are numerous and familiar, beginning with the first
chapter of the Bible with a triad of "lights" (sun, moon, stars), in the
fifth with Noah and his three sons, in the fifteenth with a sacrifice of
"a heifer of three days old, and a she goat of three days old, and a ram
of three days old" (cf. the Τριττύς and the *Suovetaurilia*). It may
also be noted that Daniel prayed "three times a day" (Dan. 6:10)[1]
and that the Apostle Paul said (II Cor. 12:8) τρὶς τὸν Κύριον παρα-
κάλεσα. Note also the three Christian Graces.

Illustrations are so numerous in English literature that it would
need a separate book to record them. We can only note Shake-
speare's "the three weird sisters" (note their incantation in Mac-
beth), Falstaff's remark, "good luck lies in odd numbers, either

---

[1] It is a custom of the Hebrews at the present time, and one going back for many
generations, to offer 3 prayers at the evening service, repeating each 3 times, and at the
evening service for the Sabbath to offer four prayers, each given 3 times; cf. *Daily
Prayers* . . . . *Vienna* (1857), pp. 251, 333. Anatole Le Braz, in his *Le Sonneur de Garland*
(1911), tells us of a very religious woman "who swept the chapel of the church accord-
ing to the rite on 3 consecutive Mondays," and in his *Le Trésor de Nöel* that Jean
tested the report that oxen on Christmas nights talked like human beings, by going on
3 consecutive Christmases to 3 different stables (the scene is in Brittany, where such
usages abound). Cf. also a Russian Christmas (*Kolyada*) song: "We found Kolyada
in Peter's courtyard. In the middle of the court there are *three* rooms," etc., and
Dostoĭevski, *Christmas Tree:* "At a window behind the pane *three* dolls . . . . *three*
old men," etc.

in nature, chance, or death"; the Ancient Mariner (a tale told to 3 wedding guests), Part 3: "I've won! Quoth she and whistles thrice"; Milton's trinity of trinities in his description of the "Gates of Hell," "thrice threefold" (3 of brass, 3 of iron, 3 of adamantine rock),[1] and De Quincey's "Our Ladies of Sorrow" whom he has made 3: *Mater Lachrymarum, M. Suspiriorum, M. Tenebrarum.*

There is a wideness in the use of the mystic 3 that is simply amazing. Note the following restricted heterogeneous list: the 3 distinct parts of Solomon's Temple, the 3d consisting of 3 stories supported by 3 successive abatements; the Greek temple, the Heraeum, with its 3 chief parts (*naos, pronaos, opisthodomus*), the 3 Greek orders of the capital, the triglyphs of the Doric frieze; the use of the trefoil and trifolium in mediaeval architecture, the mediaeval *trivium* and *quadrivium*, the tricolor, the 3-mile limit of international law, the tripartite division of our government (legislative, judicial, executive), and of the army (3 battalions = 1 regiment, 3 regiments = 1 brigade, 3 brigades = 1 division, 3 divisions = 1 corps, 3 corps = 1 army), the trifacial nerve with its 3 main branches and threefold function, the syllogism with its 3 parts, and even grammar with its 3 persons, 3 numbers, 3 voices, 3 genders, 3 degrees of comparison, 3 kinds of accent, etc.[2] It is significant mathematically, mystically, and grammatically that the number 3 is called "plural," and that "plural" is used not only for 3, but for any indefinitely large number, a fact which renders the use by some peoples of "three" in the sense of "many" less remarkable. Furthermore, we may also note that according to the philosopher Comte, the human mind in its development passes through 3 stages, that Hegel's

---

[1] Vergil (*Aen.* vi. 549) has simply: "*Moenia . . . . triplici circumdata muro.*"

[2] Cf. further Wundt, *op. cit.*, I, II², pp. 187 f. But the number three is not restricted to such serious books as the one just mentioned. It also has a use which may be called the Novelistic Three, the number which seems to fall subconsciously and automatically from the pen of the novelist. The reason underlying this use, though it may seem to some to be trifling, has its psychological interest and is one of the problems that is discussed in this study. Illustrations are numerous. See, for example, *Hearst's Magazine* for Dec., 1916. It may be noted also that Maurice Le Blanc, *The Frontier* (1912), p. 238 says: "drunk with rage, she thrice spat in her face." One may cite also (thanks to my colleague, Professor Francois) a popular old French song, *Cadet Rousselle*, who, according to the song, had 3 houses, 3 costumes, 3 hats, 3 beautiful eyes (one being a monocle), 3 pairs of shoes, 3 hairs, 3 boys, 3 dogs, 3 cats, 3 daughters, and to pay his bills, 3 pennies.

philosophy largely centers in this number, with its 3 main divisions, every part following the triadic law, and with its basic principle that every truth has its 3 aspects (thesis, antithesis, and a resulting synthesis). It is to be noted also that Cicero speaks of Plato's *philosophandi ratio triplex* (*Acad.* i. 19), then *animus triplex* (*Tusc.* i. 20; *Div.* i. 61), and that Placidus (*loc. cit.*, v. 82) refers to Pythagoras' *trinam regulam divinae rationis*. Before leaving the realm of philosophy, Kant's "three principles of homogeneity" may also be cited.

To take a brief scamper through another field. Pedagogy has its 3 M's (man, matter, mind), the Corsican (Merimée, *Columba*, chap. 3) his 3 ways in dealing with an enemy, the 3 S's (*schioppétto, stiletto, strada*), the Bourbons their 3 F's, by which they are said to have ruled Naples: *Feste, Farina, Fórche*. I shall say nothing of those whose ideas of the proper bounds of education are limited by the 3 R's. The drama, too, has its 3 moments, or crises, separated by 3 important scenic effects (Freytag, *op. cit.*, p. 115); the Odd Fellows, their emblem, 3 rings joined together; the names of most college fraternities, their 3 letters; the pawnbrokers, their cluster of 3 gold-colored balls, etc., *ad infinitum*. It would seem that the various grades of society had agreed among themselves that "Aller guten Dingen sind Drei" and that "the third time's the charm."

As an illustration of the use of 3 in an indefinite sense may be noted the Greek "Τρεῖς ὄχλος," the German "Drei eine Menge" (cf. also "Drei Käse hoch"), the Italian "Tre lo sanno, tutto lo sanno," and the English "three's a crowd." The use of the indefinite "three" and "thrice" in historic times is as old as Orpheus and Homer in Greek and as old as Plautus in Latin. As Plutarch says (*De Is. et Osir.* 36), instead of "many times" we generally say "thrice." Its use with an adjective to form a kind of superlative is particularly common, as, e.g., Orpheus using τριγίγας for "a huge giant," Homer τρίλλιστος for "often prayed for," the Greek[1] τρὶς

---

[1] The Greek dictionary (Liddell and Scott) cites 25 compounds of τρι-, 7 of τρις- and 1 of τριτο-, the Latin (Harper's), 6 of tri-, 1 of ter- (adding that the indefinite sense is frequent), all defined as "very," etc. *Ter* is common in an indefinite sense from Plautus on. This writer, to express the other pole of the superlative idea, to say that something is "trifling," or "of absolutely no value," uses *teruncius* (*Capt.* 477, etc.), a word finding favor with Cicero (*Att.* v. 20. 6, etc.), or *triobulus* (*Poen.* 381, etc.), but Persius (v. 76) to express the very same idea uses *tressis*. The Greek use of τρία ἔπεα is paralleled by the Latin *tria verba*. Pacuvius used *tripotens*, with which we may compare the portentous German word, *Neunkraftkraut*.

μάκαρος, Latin[1] *ter felix*, and the English "thrice happy." This
usage is also not infrequent in English, as may be seen from the fact
that Allibone (*Poet. Quots.*) cites eight poets who use the expression
"thrice happy" and that Bartlett (*Concordance*) lists 17 compounds
of "thrice" used by Shakespeare. With Shakespeare's "thrice a
villain" one may compare Plautus' *trifurcifer*. In the Bible also this
use is found, as "a three days' journey" (Gen. 30:36; Ex. 3:18, etc.),
and R. M. Meyer (*op. cit.*, p. 529) speaking for the Germanic peoples
says: "wir sahen, wie häufig für eine unbegrenzte Zahl von Geistern
oder Dämonen symbolisch die Dreizahl eintritt."

### EXPLANATORY NOTES

That the number 3 has often a meaning far different from its
numerical value has been commented on by the ancients, as, e.g.,
Aristotle (*De Caelo*, i. 1): "the triad is the number of the complete
whole, inasmuch as it contains a beginning, a middle, and an end.
Nature herself has provided us with this number for use in the holy
service of the gods";[2] Plutarch (*Fab.* 4 Perrin): "now the reason
for the exact prescription of this particular number (i.e., 333,333⅓) is
hard to give, unless it was thereby desired to laud the number 3, as
being a perfect number by nature, the first of odd numbers, the
beginning of quantity, and as containing in itself the first differences
and the elements of every number mingled and blended together"
(cf. also *Quaest. Rom.* 102; *De Is.* 36. 151). Vergil (*Ecl.* viii. 75)
says "numero deus impare gaudet," and Servius in commenting
thereon refers to the belief of the Pythagoreans "qui ternarium
numerum perfectum summo deo adsignant, a quo initium et medium
et finis erat," and adds the significant remark: "Impar numerus
immortalis, quia dividi integer non potest, par numerus mortalis,
quia dividi potest." His explanation of the use of *ter* in vii. 229 is
also to be noted: "aut saepius aut re vera ter," and to 700: "saepius:
finitus pro infinito." Ausonius' interest in this number is shown by
his composition of a poem in 90 verses, *Gryphus Ternarii Numeri*,

---

[1] It may be noted by way of contrast that the French and Spanish generally use
"four" for an indefinite number of times; cf. *couper un cheveu en quatre*, "to split a
hair"; *faire le Diable à quatre*, "to raise the Dickens," etc. Plautus also used in this
way, *centum, ducenti*, and *mille* (cf. *Arch. f. lat. Lex.*, IX, 178 f.).

[2] Cf. Diels, *Frg. d. Vorsokratiker*, p. 222: πάντα τρία, etc.

showing its varied uses (cf. l. 53 *Tris . . . . numerus perfectus*).  Cf. also Festus, *s.v. Imparem:*  Macr. S. 1. 13. 5, *Somn. Scip.* i. 2. 1; ii. 2. 17;  Placidus to Stat. *Theb.* v. 86; and Apul. *De Mundo* 38.[1]

This rapid survey of this vast field is sufficient to show the universality of the use of the mystic number 3, and that, too, it is to be noted, not only by uncivilized[2] nations, but by civilized, and not only in ancient, but also in modern, times.  In the quest for an explanation of the mental conceptions that gave birth to this phenomenon, it is obviously necessary in the first place to divest the mind of all preconceived notions, to rid it of all modern conceptions, and with an open mind try to enter into primitive man's simple mental processes.  Only when thus oriented can we hope to discover this use in its incipiency.  His conceptions were not built in a day any more than Rome was.  Beginning with matters terrestrial he soon transferred them to matters celestial.  The beginning was simple and natural, and there can be little doubt that the idea of triplicity first suggested itself from, and first[3] manifested itself, as Wundt (*loc. cit.*) maintains, in a grouping of objects that were closely related, naturally connected together, and therefore assumes as its beginning the triad of persons, father, mother, and child, the simplest form of the monogamic family.  This conception was early transferred to the gods, and it is significant that in the most ancient religions there are such family groups of trinities.  The conception of three composing one readily resolved itself into its counterpart,

[1] Dante's use of the number 3 (*The New Life*, p. 71, Norton) to prove that Beatrice is a miracle, as also in the structure of his sonnets, is interesting.

[2] It would seem that to primitive man, in the phrase of Voltaire, "God made man, and man returned the compliment," or as R. P. Knight says of the Trimurti "Symbol," *Lang. of Anc. Art and Myth.* § 229: "this triform division of the personified attributes or modes of action of one first cause seems to have been the first departure from simple theism, and the foundation of religious mythology in every part of the earth."

[3] In a scientific treatment of this subject note should also be taken of a different explanation of the origin of the conception of a trinity.  See, e.g., Inman, *Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism*[2] (1874).  According to Richard M. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 68: "Phallische Züge fehlen keiner Mythologie, auch nicht der altgermanischen" (cf. also pp. 52, 486).  Cf. also C. Howard, *Sex Worship*[3] (1909), p. 12; Creuzer, *Symbol. u. Meth.*[3], IV, 872; Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, I, 660; Preller, *Gr. Myth.*[3], pp. 302, 311, 444; *Rom. Myth.*[3], pp. 49, 228; Wissowa, *Rel. u. Kunst*[2] (1912), pp. 243, 299, etc. It seems more natural, however, to assume (absolute certainty is of course impossible) that the trinity-idea first entered primitive man's mind from the more obvious trinity of the family, or from one of the multitude of triads in nature about him.

one composed of three.   The former conception led to a trinity of
gods, the latter to the creation of beings composed of 3 bodies, as
of Hecate, etc., and of those with one member divided into 3 parts, as of
gods with 3 heads, 3 eyes, etc.   The three-in-one idea was given its
simplest expression by the Pythagoreans, who adopted the triangle,[1]
"the most perfect geometrical figure, inasmuch as it was the first
form complete in itself."   It was only natural therefore that the
number 3, being graphically represented by the Greek mathematicians
by a triangle (a figure composed of 3 lines, 3 angles, its angles meas-
ured in 3 ways, and only 3), which was regarded as perfect, should
on account of this representation also come to be regarded as the
perfect number.   There were also other considerations that tended
to deepen this conviction, the fact that 3 is the sum of the mystic 1
and of the mystic 2, that is, could not be divided (cf. Servius' note
p. 69 supra), and was therefore like the gods, immortal, perfect,
sacred.   Its frequent and natural association with the gods and
their worship, the belief in their perfection and in the perfection of
their handiwork, the world of nature, could not have been without
its influence in giving an impetus to the belief that 3 was a sacred
and perfect number.   The conception of a triplicity of similar
objects easily developed into a conception of a triplicity of dissimilar
objects, and these two conceptions, working side by side, led to the
vast majority of the symbolic uses of this number in classical and
later times.   The natural groupings of 3's in the world about him,
such as of birth, life, death, as of land, sky, water[2] (cf. triplicis
mundi, Ovid Metamorph. xii. 40), as of sun, moon, stars, as of the 3
phases of the moon (new, full, quarter) and the consequent 3 divi-
sions of the month, as of the 3 seasons of the ancient Greeks and
Germans (Tac. Germ. 26), to say nothing of Vedic times (Schrader,

[1] It should be noted that the triangle was not only a symbol of the Trimurti, but
was also used in connection with the worship of Mithras, Krishna, Osiris, and Apis.
In the minds of the early church Fathers the equilateral triangle was regarded as the
simplest and most effective symbol of the Trinity in Unity.   The frequent representa-
tion in Christian art of the all-seeing eye of God in the midst of a triangle is well known.

[2] This conception is regarded by Simrock (Deutsche Mythol., p. 100) as the primary
cause of triads of gods: "die Götter der Trias waren ursprünglich Elementargötter,
dem Wesen jedes der Drei liegt eins der Elemente, Luft, Wasser, und Feuer zu Grunde,
und von dieser ihrer elementaren Natur ist erst ihre geistige Bedeutung ausgegangen,"
a view which is quoted with approval by A. F. Pott, Zeitschr. f. Völkerpsychologie,
XIV (1883), 133.   For the "astrological origin" of the trinity concept see Cumont,
Astrol. and Rel. (1912), p. 111.

*Spr. u. Urgesch.*[3], II [1906], 239, 510), as of the 3 dimensions[1] (length, breadth, thickness), as of the 3 states of matter (solid, liquid, gaseous), as of the 3 kingdoms (animal, vegetable, mineral), etc.,[2] must have early forced themselves upon his attention and have greatly influenced his trend of thought. It was only natural that the threefold division of the visible world into earth, sky, water, should have developed into the threefold division of the Cosmos into the earth, the sky, and the underworld, with the assignment to each of its own ruler, and as in the family group one member was endowed with superior power and authority, so also in the divine trinity there was one superior to the other two. Such a conception of a trinity of gods found expression, not only among the Babylonians and Egyptians,[3] but also among the Greeks and Romans.

In the study of the earliest manifestations of the symbolic 3, regard must also be had for the fact that there have been, and still are, primitive peoples whose ideas of number do not go beyond 3. In addition to this is the fact that there are many peoples who, for one reason or another, never heard of, and, even if they had, could not grasp, the meaning of the Pythagorean arithmetical dogma, and to whom the Aristotelian formula of a beginning, a middle, and an end was as a book sealed with seven seals. Tylor (*Primitive Culture*, I[3], 241) cites nations of the Far East who did not count beyond the number 3, and who used that number, not only for the definite 3, but also for a number of indefinite size.[4] This usage, while characteristic of primitive man, shows some interesting survivals in the usage of the most highly educated, as Vergil's 333 years (cf. p. 56 *supra*), Horace's *ter felix*, Shakespeare's "thrice happy," etc.

[1] To Brinton ("The Origin of Sacred Numbers," *Amer. Anthropologist*, VII [1894], 168 f.) this was the conception from which sprang such expressions as "Indra, Lord of Three Worlds," etc. His conclusion is summed up as follows: "The number three derives its sacredness from abstract, subjective operations of the intelligence and has its main application in the imaginary and non-phenomenal world," supporting his view in part by the law that "all operations of the mind proceed in accordance with the three fundamental laws of thought—Identity, Diversity, and the excluded Middle."

[2] Furthermore, he must have discovered at an early stage of his development the 3 primary divisions of his own arm and of his own leg, and of their corresponding parts in the common vertebrates, to say nothing of the 3 segments of his fingers.

[3] Cf. Jastrow, *Die Religion Babylon. u. Assyr.* I, 244 f.; Wiedemann, *Religion d. alt. Aegypter*, pp. 60 f. Cf. also E. A. W. Budge, *The Gods of the Egyptians*, I (1904), 113 f.

[4] H. Diels, *Archiv. f. Gesch. d. Philosophie*, X (1897), 232, regards this fact as the explanation for the early and extended use of the triad. So Eusener, p. 261.

The third of these symbolic uses to be developed was the temporal triad, owing to the fact that one of the 3 elements, the present, is an abstraction, beyond the mental powers of primitive man.[1]  The other two ideas, the past and future, he could, and did, grasp.  It is a significant fact that there are languages in which the present tense as such is lacking in general use (e.g., in the Hebrew).[2]  As an inherent element in the temporal triad is the threefold repetition of the same act, as in thrice offering a prayer or in thrice repeating an oath (cf. pp. 61 and 65 *supra*), under the belief that in this way it is rendered more potent, more likely to produce the desired effect. This conception, however, was late in developing and found its widest expression in the realm of charms and magic formulae (cf. p. 62 f.). The exact details of the explanation of Paul's "I thrice besought the Lord" are left to the theologians.   The fourth stage to be developed was the conception of emanations, one of the three chief theories of existence, but the discussion of this we leave to the philosophers and theologians.   The fifth and last step in the development of the triad is the conception of the Holy Trinity.   The cycle is complete.   As Wundt (*op. cit.*, p. 539) says: "Inbesondere bleibt die Göttertrias, wie sie wahrscheinlich die ältest Form der heiligen Drei gewesen, so auch die letzte und anschaulichste."

Taking a general survey of the entire field and of the manifold and varied uses of the symbolic 3 among all nations and all peoples, the conclusion has been reached that its use in general is due to 3 principal causes, in part to primitive conceptions, in part to the philosophical speculations of Pythagoras, Aristotle, and their followers, and, in certain spheres of its later development, to the conception of the Holy Trinity.   The modern world is indeed a product of the past, and we can do no better than to conclude with Woelfflin (*Arch. f. lat. Lex.*, IX, 334: "Wenn wir heute sagen 'aller guten Dinge sind drei,' so befinden wir uns damit in Übereinstimmung sowohl mit dem Heidentume als mit dem Christentum."

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

[1] It may be noted here that in Latin several uses of the present grew out of the conception that the present is only a variable point, a dividing line between the past and the future, and therefore has no time in and of itself.

[2] For the temporal triads see p. 59 *supra*.

# THE COLUMNA ROSTRATA OF C. DUILLIUS

## By Tenney Frank

A reference to recent grammars and histories shows that the famous inscription of the Columna Rostrata (Dessau *I.L.S.* 65) has again fallen into disrepute. It will be remembered that Ritschl and Mommsen pronounced it an antiquarian invention of the early empire. In 1890, however, Woelfflin by an able discussion[1] restored faith in it so that for a decade at least it was freely cited by historians and philologists. Woelfflin argued that so many ancient forms and phrases occurred in the inscription that it must in the main be regarded as a fairly faithful copy of a third-century original, and that the forms which were obviously of a later date could best be explained as due to the mistaken attempts of a restorer to invent archaisms in order to replace parts of the original that had been broken or rendered illegible by age. This view seems to me not impossible, though at present it has been generally abandoned for Mommsen's theory. Woelfflin's enduring contribution to the discussion lies in having pointed out the real archaic character of several phrases that up to his time were classed as examples of late and rhetorical verbiage. He noticed for instance that the use of *que* to the exclusion of *et* was characteristic of early documents, especially documents of an official character like the *lex Agraria*, the *lex Cornelia*, and the *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*;[2] that the phrase *clases navales*[3] was not redundant but a natural expression in the early day when *classis* meant "levy" whether of land or sea forces; that *praesente* . . . . *dictatored* preserved in the participle a legitimate old meaning which was conserved in various other verbal forms of *praeesse*, "to have charge of"; that the phrase *inaltod mare* could have been used only before *altum* became a substantive and a synonym of *mare*, a change

---

[1] *Sitz. Münch. Akad.*, 1890, pp. 293 ff.

[2] Note that *que* occurs three times in the four lines of the very old inscription of the Faliscan guild, Dessau *I.L.S.* 3083.

[3] Paulus Festus, 225: *multitudo hominum quam navium;* also 56: *classis clipeata;* and 248: *classis procincta.*

that was taking place in the days of Plautus; and so on. Whoever will collect these remarkable archaisms—note the number of such excellent old forms as *exemet, inaltod, marid, olorom, triresmos, navebos, numei,* and *navaled,* consider the non-appearance of such forms as *quom, endo,* and *ai,* which an antiquarian would naturally have selected, and remember that we have no sure case of conscious archaizing of inscriptions—should be convinced that at least the substance of the inscription rests upon a genuine original.

The recent aversion to the inscription seems to be based chiefly upon Norden's assertion[1] that in comparison with the simple and jejune epitaphs and honorific inscriptions of the following two centuries the Duillian eulogy is fulsome and rhetorical; that in fact it is too self-conscious an effort to be attributed to the Romans before the day of their first literary attempts. It must be admitted that the inscription does not harmonize with Roman character of the third century as we know it. Perhaps, however, it is so un-Roman precisely because Rome had as yet no stylistic and formal literary models for Duillius to follow.

It was indeed in Sicily, among the most rhetorical of the Greeks and in their most verbose days, that Duillius achieved his fame. He campaigned between Agrigentum and Segesta before and after his temporary naval command, and doubtless, like other Roman generals in Sicily, spent some days during the rainy season in the hospitable companionship of the gracious Hiero at Syracuse. That Roman officers acquired in this way an acquaintance with many things besides the Greek drama which they at once transplanted to Rome is of course well known. And the man who, according to Cicero, found pleasure in a cortège of pipers and torchbearers could hardly have failed to note during his Sicilian campaigns the elaborate eulogies with which every petty Greek official was immortalized by his native city. In lieu of contemporary Sicilian examples, which have not survived, we may refer to the typical inscription which the Athenians had engraved in honor of Phaedrus some ten years before.[2] For services that Duillius might well have smiled at Phaedrus

---

[1] *De Stilone, Cosconio, Varrone,* 1895. Cf. F. D. Allen, *Early Latin,* p. 67, who questioned the inscription on stylistic grounds long before Norden.

[2] *Ditt. Syll.*[3] No. 409.

received the honors of the gilded crown, a seat at the public tables and at public games, a bronze bust, and an inscription of a hundred periphrastic lines setting forth not only his own deeds but those of his father and grandfather as well. A brief extract will perhaps serve to illustrate the redundant and padded eulogies current in Duillius' time:

ἐπλε]υσεν ἐπὶ τῶν νεῶν ᾶς ὁ δῆμος . . . . συμέπεμπεν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν καὶ συνεδιεπολέμησεν τὸν πόλεμον τὸν ἐν Κύπρωι καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἄγνωνα τὸν Τ[ηιο]ν καὶ τὰς ναῦς τὰς μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπὶ Πραξιβούλου ἄρχοντος, Γλαυκέτου καθειληφότος Κίθνον καὶ καταγαγόντος ἐντεῦθεν τὰ πλοῖα, τήν τε πόλιν ἔλαβεν καὶ αὐτὸν Γλαυκέτην καὶ τὰ πλοῖα τὰ μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ παρεσκεύασεν ἀσφάλειαν τοῖς πλέουσι τὴν θάλατταν, and so on to the dreary end.

Though this is of course not the model of the columnar inscription, it reveals the style of the honorific tributes which met the Roman in every public square in Sicily. The frequently criticized boast "rem navebos *primos* c < eset > " reminds one of χειροτονηθεὶς πρῶτος of line 45; the fulsome style of "clasesque navales primos ornavet pa < ravetque > cumque eis navebos claseis Poenicas omnis" is cast in the style of Γλαυκέτου καθειληφότος Κίθνον καὶ καταγαγόν-τος ἐντεῦθεν τὰ πλοῖα τήν τε πόλιν ἔλαβεν καὶ αὐτὸν Γλαυκέτην καὶ τὰ πλοῖα τὰ μετ' αὐτοῦ, and "enque eodem mac < istratud > " when there was but one year of office is reminiscent of phrases like ἐπὶ Νικίου μὲν ἄρχοντος στρατηγὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου χειροτονηθεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν παρασκευὴν δὶς πάντων ὦμ προσῆκεν ἐπεμελήθη καλῶς (*ibid.* ll. 21 ff.). Even the form which the honor took was probably suggested by Greek practice and imitated to the extent that Roman custom might permit, for as Phaedrus received an εἰκόνα χαλκῆν ἐν ἀγορᾶι (l. 81), an honorary inscription ἐν στήλει λιθίνει παρὰ τὴν εἰκόνα (l. 90), and the right of continuing in private life the use of magisterial insignia (ll. 72 ff.), so Duillius was accorded a statue in the forum, a public record of his deeds, and the continued use in private life of consular attendants *cum tibicine et funali*.[1]

Other Romans may have thought Duillius vain, as Cicero implies, but the character of Greek eulogies could hardly have been unknown to them. Only a few years previously the Thurians had set up

[1] Pliny *N.H.*, xxxiv, 32.

statues in Rome to the tribune Sthennius, who had first urged the
defense of Thurii against Pyrrhus, and to Fabricius, who had finally
defeated Pyrrhus, and it is not likely that the inscriptions composed
by them were written in the blunt Latin of that day.

That succeeding generations failed to follow the example of
Duillius is not surprising.   The long Punic wars succeeded in bring-
ing the aristocracy back into power at Rome, where it remained for a
century, and the Senate under oligarchic control always strove to
reduce the consuls and the military heroes to modest behavior.   The
Romans meanwhile grew conscious of their own position in the world,
and after that they fell less readily into the temptation of imitating
the sentimental Greeks in ways that failed to harmonize with their
own sense of what was proper and dignified.   Even the two oldest
Scipionic inscriptions with their *Honc oino* and *forma virtutei parisuma*
seem laudatory in comparison with those of the following century;
their authors apparently were still somewhat under the spell of the
foreign manner.

It would seem then that the critics who reject the inscription
have failed to sustain their case, and that Woelfflin's faith in the
substance of it is fully justified.   Even his explanation of the incon-
sistent forms as being due to an attempt to restore the illegible words
with plausible if mistaken archaisms is conceivably acceptable.
This explanation, however, is open to two possible objections: in
the first place, we know of no other instance of conscious archaizing,
and, secondly, it seems strange that this hypothetical antiquarian
would have sanctioned such modern-looking forms as *aes*, *praeda*,
*cum*, and *navales* if he really desired to give his restorations an
antique appearance.

Since the inconsistent spellings all conform to the orthography
in vogue about 150 B.C., it seems somewhat more probable to me
that the columna, before its final restoration in the empire, had
already been restored during the second century, possibly by some
descendant of the hero.   Restoration of ancestral monuments in
more lasting form was frequently undertaken by proud descendants
or public-spirited citizens, not only when the original had been
destroyed by fire or other accident, but also when the original no
longer satisfied the aesthetic demands of the later age.   Pliny

happens to remark that the statues of the Sibyls were so restored by S. Pacuius and M. Messala;[1] the triumphal arch of Fabius Allobrogicus was restored by his grandson, the Basilica Aemilia was repeatedly restored and beautified by the later members of the Aemilian gens, and there are numerous other cases of the kind.   The original Columna Rostrata of 260 B.C. was doubtless built of the rude and friable tufa then constantly in use.   It can still be seen in the Servian wall near the railway station.   This is a material wholly unsuitable for works of art.   In the frequent changes within the Forum during the second century when new statues of travertine and marble were being erected the ugly monument may well have been replaced by one more befitting its surroundings.   Possibly the original, like the statue of Aemilius (*tempestas disjecisset*, Livy xlii, 17), had been wrecked by storm, or by the boisterous election crowds, or by the mobs that frequently attended the games in the Forum; or it may have been ruined by fire.   The devastating fire of 210 B.C. ruined almost everything between the carcer and the temple of Vesta,[2] and the columna apparently stood on or near the older rostra.[3]   These buildings were restored from time to time after the Punic war.   The building of the novae tabernae in 192, or of Cato's basilica in 185, or of the Aemilian basilica in 179 may have caused readjustments in the placing of the monuments in the upper end of the Forum.   In 158 there must have been a general rearrangement of honorific monuments since the censors of that year ordered the removal of all statues that had not been placed by official decree of the senate or people.[4]   A second redisposition of monuments near the rostra must have occurred in 145, when the popular assemblies were removed from the north to the south of the old rostra.

The hypothesis of a second century restoration, therefore, seems at least possible.   It becomes indeed probable when the inscriptional forms, which have proved so troublesome in the light of other hypotheses, are examined.

[1] *N.H.* xxxiv, 22.

[2] Livy, xxvi, 27.

[3] *In rostris . . . . vidimus*, Servius in *Georg.* iii, 29.   The earlier writers who saw it say simply *in foro*: Pliny, *N.H.* xxxiv, 20; Quint. i, 7.   The fragments were found near the arch of Severus, that is, near the new rostra.

[4] Pliny, *N.H.* xxxiv, 30.

The forms *claseis* and *naveis* occur by the side of *clases* and *navales*, and it is usually supposed that these words contain a mixture of old, pseudoarchaic, and classical forms.    Obviously the single consonant *s* suggests an early date;  the diphthong *ei*, on the other hand, could not belong to 260 B.C., nor does it accord well with the first decades of our era, for spurious *ei* does not occur in accusative plural endings of vowel-stem nouns as late as the date of the final restoration of this inscription.[1]   The forms *claseis* and *naveis* are, however, quite possible for the period about 150 B.C., that is, for the period of the posited restoration of this inscription.   The single consonant persisted through most of the second century, as witness *suma*[2] of the Gracchan period.   Our earliest inscriptional example of the spurious *ei*[3] dates from 146 B.C., but inscriptions are so rare for the two decades preceding this date that we are not in a position to claim that it did not occur several years earlier.   The fact that Turpilius could contract *flagitieis* into *flagitis*[4] would seem to indicate that unaccented *ei* had become phonetically equivalent to *i* before the middle of the century.

The ending *es* of *clases* and *navales* are probably due to the imperial restorer or stonecutter, but we have no right to exclude a hypothesis that these forms may also date from the second-century restorer.   This *es* of the accusative plural of vowel stems does not as a matter of fact appear in inscriptions till the end of the century,[5] but there are two facts to consider with reference to it.   Inscriptions dating from the middle of the century offer very few instances of just these forms from which to draw conclusions; and, secondly, since the *es* of vowel stems came into use through a confusion between vowel and consonant stems, it is highly probable that it appeared sporadically all through the second century B.C., since such confusion occurs in the other case forms then.[6]   If this is so, the single consonant of *clases* accords with the ending *es* and the whole word may possibly be attributed to the earlier restorer.

[1] Lommatzsch, *Archiv*, XV, 129.
[2] *C.I.L.*, I, 551.
[3] *faxseis*, *C.I.L.* I, 542.
[4] Sturtevant, *Contraction in Case Forms*, p. 6.
[5] *omnes*, *C.I.L.* I, 577, 105 B.C.
[6] See Stolz, pp. 204 and 211.

The form *consol* fits the second century and that alone. In 260 B.C. the word was probably written *cosol*, while *consul* was of course the form in the empire. The *ns* of *Cartaciniensis* must belong to the same writing as *consol*. *Poenicas* seems also to be the work of the earlier restorer. The word was doubtless spelled with *oi* in 260, while at the time of the imperial restorer *oe* had long since passed to *u*.

The uniform adoption of *ae* in *praesente*, *praedad*, and *aes* is usually attributed to the imperial restorer or stonecutter, but it may also be due to an earlier restorer since the diphthong *ae* occurs in inscriptions as early as the *S.C. de Bacch.*, 189 B.C.

With our hypothesis *macistr<a>tos* need not be taken as an invention of an imaginative imperial restorer. The dramatists of the second century often treated *u*-stem nouns as belonging to *o*-stems, and the confusion may be very old. *Navaled* and *dictatored* can now be accepted as correct third-century forms since the appearance of *<c>osoled*[1] has lent them respectability.[2] No real difficulty is presented by the fact that the former should end in *id*, for vowel and consonant stems were frequently confused in early Latin. According to Hodgman,[3] Plautus alone presents a score of examples of such confusion in the ablative singular forms.

Finally, by positing an intermediate restoration and thus accounting for several hitherto inexplicable forms, we may accord fuller faith to such old words as *maximos* and *navebos*, which have been viewed with needless skepticism in the past. Brugmann's explanation of the variation between *u* and *i*[4] leads one to expect *maximos* as older than *maxumos*. Whether both forms (in *i* and in *u*) occurred in the inscription of 260 B.C. we cannot say positively, but there is no sound reason for doubting that they did. I should be inclined to attribute *<ma>ximos* of line 3 to the original inscription, and *<max>umos* of line 9 to the original or to the second-century restoration. *Navebos* has also been rejected as an unsafe form, but Sommer[5] is certainly right in accepting it. The ending is orthodox and is paralleled by *protrebibos* of *C.I.L.* IX, 4204, while the *e* is supported by the spelling *tempestatebus* in I, 32. The word evidently came down unchanged from the original inscription. *Exfociont* remains then the only

---

[1] *Notizie*, 1900, 499, and *C.I.L.* I, 2, No. 19.

[2] Brugmann, *K. Verg. Gr.*, 383.

[3] *Class. Rev.*, XVI, 298.      [4] *Grd.* I, p. 224.      [5] P. 385.

unexplained word, and this may be a stonecutter's error induced by
the occurrence of the unusual *o* of the ending.

If this hypothesis is correct, then, the main body of the inscription
goes back to 260 B.C., while a restorer of about 150 B.C. supplied at
illegible places the following forms in the orthography of his day: *ns*
of *consol* and *Cartaciniensis, eis Poe* of l. 8, *ae* in l. 9, *eis* in l. 12,
and possibly *es* in l. 7 and *ae* of ll. 14 and 17.   Most of the forms that
are certainly of the second century fall close together in the center
of the present inscription at ll. 6–9, so that it seems not improbable
that the original was spaced line for line exactly as the extant one is
and that it was rather badly marred in one place before the first
restoration.

The final restoration was of course made in the early empire.
Perhaps the *curatores tabularum publicarum* appointed by Tiberius
in the year 16 A.D. to restore δημόσια γράμματα (Dio 57, 16) had the
work done, or Tiberius himself in the following year when he rebuilt
the temple of Janus which Duillius had erected (Tac. *Ann.* II, 49)
and which may have been mentioned in the last portion of our
inscription.   That the final restorer took some pains to follow his
copy with care is proved by the fact that he corrected the erroneous
*u* to *o* in *navebos*, and this fact should guard us from attributing many
modernizations to him.   The only changes that one is compelled to
attribute to him are the use of *i-longa*, which is purely orthographic,
and the apparently mistaken *o* of *exfociont*.

Regarding the form of the original monument only a word need
be said.   It is likely that the statue mentioned by the elogium of
Duillius in the Augustan Forum[1] stood on top of the columna, as in
the case of the old columnar statue of Minucius,[2] and the columna
rostrata of Augustus.[3]   Since the authorities of the imperial time
who had seen the new column do not mention the statue, we may
assume that it had met with some accident or had been removed
as an offense to the eye before this time.   We are told that old tufa
and terra-cotta statues were not in favor in Cato's day.

Of the inscription, fulsome as it is, something has apparently
been lost, possibly as much as fifteen lines if the base—which we

[1] See Dessau, *I.L.S.* 55.   It was discovered in 1890.
[2] Represented on coins; see Grueber, III, Pl. 26, 15.
[3] See Grueber, III, Pl. 59, 18.

need not assume—had the normal proportions of statue bases, that is, length to width about three to two. The first line probably contained the name and title of the hero, as in the elogia of the Augustan Forum; and since Florus assumes (erroneously, of course) that Duillius had himself erected the column, the inscription may have failed to mention who had authorized the erection. If it was suggested by the Greek inscriptions of the day, the lost portion at the end probably mentioned the hero's benefactions, as for instance the gift of the temple of Janus[1] (Tac. *Ann.* II, 49), and gave a full list of the honors voted him by the senate and people,[2] not failing to note that his was the first naval triumph,[3] and perhaps adding the fact that *huic permissum est, ut ab epulis domum cum tibicine et funali rediret.*[4] Indeed the prominence given by the elogium and by so many authorities to these vain honors can be plausibly explained if we assume that this peculiar inscription, which followed the pompous Greek fashion of recording such trivialities,[5] was their source. At any rate Silius Italicus, who gives a fairly full list of the traditional details, seems to have had the monument and the text of the inscription in mind (*Pun.* VI, 663–69). He is describing a fictitious panel of a temple door representing the deeds of Duillius:

> Aequoreum juxta decus et navale trophaeum,
> Rostra gerens nivea surgebat mole columna;
> Exuvias Marti[6] donumque Duilius, alto
> Ante omnis mersa Poenorum classe, dicabat.
> Cui, nocturnus honos, funalia clara sacerque
> Post epulas tibicen adest; castosque penatis
> Insignis laeti repetebat murmure cantus.

Bryn Mawr College

[1] Cf. the inscription of Phaedrus cited above, especially l. 30.

[2] Cf. the inscription of Phaedrus, ll. 71–91.

[3] Primus . . . . navalem de Sicul. et classe Poenica egit, Acta Triumph.

[4] Elogium; cf. Cic. *Cato* 44, Liv. *Epit.* 17, etc.

[5] There is a possibility that the *epulae* mentioned were the *Epulae Jovis* to which Duillius was perhaps granted continued admittance on the analogy of the Greek σίτησις ἐμ πρυτανείῳ and that after the inscription was marred the passage was incorrectly restored so as to combine the *epulae* with the attendant *cum tibicine* in this strange manner. If this is true the incorrect combination was made by the second-century restorer, since Cicero and the elogium agree in accepting it.

[6] This refers to the temple of Janus, which Vergil, vii, 607, also associates for obvious reasons with Mars.

# NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

## APOLLODORUS VS. PHORMIO, CRIMINAL ASSAULT[1]

Pasion, the wealthy Athenian banker, died leaving a widow and two sons, Pasicles aged nine and Apollodorus aged twenty-four. His will provided that Phormio, his freedman and trusted associate in the bank, should marry Archippe his widow with a large dowry and act as guardian of the younger son. Apparently the marriage was consummated during the absence of Apollodorus on state service. "Upon my return home," he says, "when I learned what had taken place I was exceedingly angry and indignant. I could not commence a private action as there were no actions at that time, all such business being postponed by the war; but I preferred an indictment against him before the Thesmothetae for outrage and abuse (γραφὴ ὕβρεως)." The case never came to trial. Eighteen years later he brought a civil suit for twenty talents. From the speeches delivered in the course of this later litigation is derived our information regarding the earlier criminal suit. In accounting for his failure to prosecute the case Apollodorus speaks vaguely of the dilatory tactics of Phormio as well as the intercession of his mother. A temporary reconciliation was effected. It seems quite certain that the suit was dropped voluntarily, by reason of financial considerations.[2]

The case exhibits in an interesting fashion the elasticity and resources of a legal system devised and operated by men without specific legal training, but the real ground of action has never been set forth in a satisfactory manner. Meier attempted to prove from this case that a γραφὴ ὕβρεως lay in cases of seduction. But in view of the fact that seduction was not distinguished from adultery and dealt with by means of a γραφὴ μοιχείας the view is not tenable.[3] Lipsius[4] is right in rejecting it, but his own explanation that the ground for the action was the disgrace involved in the marriage of the plaintiff's mother to a former slave of the family is equally objectionable in the absence of any indication that such a marriage was contrary to law. It would have been intolerable if a man who was legally married to a widow

---

[1] Dem. 45. 4. γραφὴ ὕβρεως. Sandys version, "criminal assault," seems preferable to Kennedy's "indictment for outrage and abuse," because in English common law assault and battery have been expanded in practice in much the same fashion as ὕβρις in this case. Both charges may be purely technical and formal to remedy a wrong not otherwise provided for.

[2] Litigants were always reluctant to admit that a suit was compromised for money owing to the fear of being classed as sycophants, to say nothing of the law against the practice. Cf. Lofberg, *Sycophancy in Athens*, p. 86.

[3] Thonissen, *Le droit pénal de la république athénienne*, p. 336.

[4] *Der Attische Process*, p. 398, n. 569; *Das Attische Recht*, p. 424.

could be haled into court as a criminal because her son fancied that he was disgraced by the marriage. Hitzig[1] calls this the most doubtful instance of a γραφὴ ὕβρεως and concludes, "man musz aber aus der Rede für den Phormio schliessen, dasz die Hybris gerade in der Verbindung mit Archippe gefunden wurde." This is rather vague, but his citation of Plato's provision for a γραφὴ αἰσχύνης γένους seems to indicate that he adheres to Lipsius' view.

Rightly or wrongly Apollodorus regarded his father's will as a forgery. The civil suit he contemplated instituting was unquestionably intended to test the validity of the will. Consequently it is natural to suppose that the γραφὴ ὕβρεως also was brought for the purpose of challenging the will. If the will was a forgery then the marriage was invalid, for Phormio had not complied with the law which required an alien claimant for the hand of an heiress to go before the proper magistrate and establish his claim.[2] Consequently his relations with Archippe were illegal and wrongful. The theory underlying the γραφὴ ὕβρεως was that they amounted to a technical assault. It was immaterial that Archippe acquiesced. Being a ward of the state she could not consent. Apollodorus as her κύριος was the proper party to bring the suit. Athenian juries were ever suspicious of purely technical pleas that alleged no loss or injury to the plaintiff resulting from the conditions complained of. Accordingly Apollodorus no doubt intended to dwell on the disgrace involved in his mother's alliance with a former slave. But this is no more a legal ground for an action than a claim on the part of a defendant that the plaintiff was a man of bad character would justify his failure to pay a debt or perform a legal contract. It is a mistake to confuse a plea to the prejudices of the jury with the ground for the action. Had Phormio been a man with the best of antecedents and character Apollodorus would still have had the same motive and the same ground for attacking an arrangement that involved financial loss for him. Little, if any, weight is to be attached to Lipsius' observation that because the case did not come to trial "ihre gesetzliche Berechtigung nicht ganz sicher ist." The case was accepted by the Thesmothetae. This acceptance assured its coming to a final hearing so far as official action was concerned. Apollodorus claimed that he dropped it voluntarily. Phormio's advocate evidently had it in mind when he said of Pasion: οὐδ' αὐτὸν ὑβρίζων οὐδ' ὑμᾶς τοὺς υἱεῖς . . . . ἔδωκε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα μητέρα δ' ὑμετέραν τούτῳ.[3] English common law exhibits an analogous extension of assault and battery so as to include administering noxious drugs and communicating venereal disease.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO            ROBERT J. BONNER

[1] *Injuria*, p. 42.

[2] Dem. 45. 27; 46. 22, 23. Sandys regards "the plaintiff's argument as the merest shuffling." This may very well be so. I am simply developing his theory of the γραφὴ ὕβρεως. He convinced the Thesmothetae that it was a proper action to bring under the circumstances. We need not inquire whether he could have hoped to convince a jury.

[3] The word ὑβρίζων is significant (Dem. 36. 30).

## ON PLATO'S *CRATYLUS* 389 D.

εἰ δὲ μὴ εἰς τὰς αὐτὰς συλλαβὰς ἕκαστος ὁ νομοθέτης τίθησιν, οὐδὲν δεῖ τοῦτο ἀ<μφι>γνοεῖν· So the Oxford text reads accepting Peiper's emendation, ἀμφιγνοεῖν, which I presume was suggested by such passages as *Polit.* 278 A; 291 B; *Sophist* 228 E. I think the manuscript reading ἀγνοεῖν can be defended, though not by Stallbaum's method of referring τοῦτο to the explanation that follows. What seems to have been overlooked is that οὐδέν is almost idiomatic with ἀγνοεῖν while I do not find it with ἀμφιγνοεῖν. The simple ἀγνοεῖν may take the meaning "find difficult" or "fail to recognize," "deem strange." See Jebb on Sophocles' *Electra* 1475, τίν' ἀγνοεῖς; "is the face so strange?"

In Euripides' *Andro.* 899 μηδὲν ἀγνόει is not quite "learn all," as Liddell and Scott render. Way's "doubt not" is better. Orestes cannot believe his eyes that he sees Hermione, and Hermione assures him that it is really she. The frequent and idiomatic combination, then, virtually means "not to be put out, baffled, or disconcerted, or to have doubts, to apprehend fully." Thus Isocrates who uses it several times says of the apparent attack on Sparta in his ambiguous Panathenaicus that the more intelligent Spartans will not be misled; they will understand the matter perfectly, οὐδὲν ἀγνοήσειν τῶν λεγομένων (251). And in the formula addressed to the jury at the close of Isaeus 7 and 8, and of Demosthenes 20, 36, 38, and 54, οἶμαι γὰρ ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ἀγνοεῖν, it practically means, "I think that I have made the whole case clear to you."

The thought of the Platonic passage, then, would be that the fact that the same semantic suggestion is sometimes embodied in different sounds or syllables ought not to put out or disconcert the student of language, or make him fail to understand the principle. This meaning could be brought out more clearly by inserting διά after δεῖ. The dropping of διά after a short word beginning with delta is, I believe, a not infrequent corruption. I tried to point out one of these cases in *Classical Philology*, IX, 191. There are others.

PAUL SHOREY

---

## NOTE ON *LAUDICENI*. (PLIN. *EPIST*. ii. 14, 5)

Pliny the Younger, writing to his friend Maximus regarding the degeneracy of legal eloquence, complains bitterly of the practice of the lawyers of his day, who paid money to a *claque* that they might thus secure for their speeches the applause which they could not win by legitimate means. Speaking of these mercenary auditors, he continues: *Inde iam non inurbane* Σοφοκλεῖς *vocantur* [ἀπὸ τοῦ σοφῶς καὶ καλεῖσθαι]: *isdem Latinum nomen inpositum est Laudiceni.*[1]

[1] Plin. *Epist.* ii. 14, 5. Keil's text.

The word *Laudiceni* is described in the lexicon of Forcellini, *s.v. Laudicenus*, as, "*Vox ioculariter ficta, de eo, qui laudat, ut ad cenam invitetur*— Plin. 2, *Ep.* 14 (quoted, as above). *Hic* Plin. *ait* Σοφοκλεῖς . . . . *eos esse per iocum appellatos, qui indisertis oratoribus, spe captandae cenae, acclamabant*, etc." This interpretation has been adopted with little or no hesitation by all the editors whose works I have been able to consult. It seems to have presented no difficulty to Merrill, for in his commentary he says,[1] "Laudiceni: of course from *laus* and *cena;* the pun on the name of the Laodiceans (*Lao-* or *Laudiceni*) is evident, the attempt being to cap the pun on a proper name in Greek by a similar pun in Latin: cf. Martial vi. 48. *Quod tam grande 'sophos' clamat tibi turba togata | Non tu, Pomponi, cena diserta tua est;* Anth. Pal. xi. 394. ποιητὴς πανάριστος ἀληθῶς ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος | ὅστις δειπνίζει τοὺς ἀκροασαμένους." Westcott seems a bit less confident. His comment is,[2] "*Laudiceni:* (*laus, cena*) *who praise for a dinner.* . . . . This may be an attempt at a pun, on *Laodiceni,* 'Laodiceans,' for which *Laudiceni* is occasionally found. But it seems sorry wit."

My objections to the interpretations here given are: (1) that *Laudiceni,* if it *is* compounded from *laus* and *cena,* cannot mean "*those who praise for a dinner,*" but only "*those who praise a dinner,*" and that there is no possibility of bringing this second translation into harmony with the rest of the passage; (2) that such a compound as *Laudiceni,* from *laus* and *cena,* is almost impossible for Latin.[3] The passages cited by Merrill, it will be noted, support no such form. Nor will the explanations, "Volkwitz," or "popular etymology," multitudinous as are the sins they may cover, hide the irregularities involved in such an interpretation as this, for the popular mind cannot be supposed to act in contravention of all rule and precedent, and it is just this which the current interpretation implies.

The following explanation seems to me far more satisfactory. Among the Romans, *Laodiceni* must commonly have been pronounced *Laudiceni,* as it was not infrequently spelled,[4] and the common people, with their fondness for etymologizing, understood this word—perhaps seriously, perhaps humorously—as a compound of *laus* and *dico,* *Laudi-dic-eni* (the suffix, with geographical significance, would present no difficulty), reduced by haplology[5] to *Laudiceni,* as *stipi-pendium* to *stipendium,* *semimestris* to

[1] *Selected Letters of the Younger Pliny* (London, 1903), p. 245.

[2] *Selected Letters of Pliny* (Boston, 1898), p. 161.

[3] Brugmann, *Grundriss* II[2], Part 1, p. 64, cites but one example of this type of compound in Latin, viz., *exercipes.* Lindsay, *Latin Language,* p. 361, cites *vincipes,* coined by Tertullian by false analogy of *nudipes;* and *Verticordia,* an epithet of Venus. But the remarkable degree to which such compounds are absent from Latin is but emphasized by these far-sought examples.

[4] *CIL,* X, 867; Orelli, 3520; cf. *CIL,* V, 4056; X, 770, Wilmanns, 915.

[5] See Oertel, *Lectures on the Study of Language* (New York, 1902), p. 208, and the authorities there cited.

*semestris*, \**nutri-trix* to *nutrix*, etc.  This type of compound is abundantly exemplified in Latin in such words as *maledicus, veridicus, causidicus*, etc., and is especially frequent in the *sermo plebeius;*[1] and although neither \**laudidicus* nor \**laudicus* is to be found, the use of the expression "*laudes dicere*"[2] would seem to indicate that a compound of these two words, if properly formed, would not have seemed too foreign for Latin ears.  It appears to have been a bit of popular humor to attach to those who sold their applause, and, perhaps, to any who were lavish in the bestowal of their praise, the appellation of "Laodiceans," that is (in the popular mind) "praise speakers."

The advantages of this interpretation are quite obvious.  In the first place, it rids the passage of the *cena*, which has caused, at least, mental uneasiness; in the second place, it supplies what may fairly be called an equivalent for Σοφοκλεῖς, which the context certainly leads us to expect;[3] and lastly, the most important advantage is that it substitutes a possible Latin compound for one that is impossible.

<div align="right">JAMES E. DUNLAP</div>

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

---

## ON THE STELE OF THE FORUM

Some aid in dating the stele inscription, probably our earliest specimen of Latin, comes from an unexpected source.  Last year while at Rome I had the good fortune to meet Commendatore Verri who has labored incessantly for a score of years upon the intricate problems of Latian geology and is now the acknowledged authority in that field.  With a generosity of information and time that seems to be unlimited he explained the intricacies of the Latian rock strata and showed how, with microscopic slides and chemical means, it was possible to classify the Roman building tufas and identify them with respect to their several native quarries.  He was called away from Rome before it occurred to me to question him regarding the stele, and naturally I could not remove a fragment from the sacred stone for examination.  But on the criteria which he provided I feel safe to say that the stone is without question the kind that is found north of the Cremera and only there, a stone that had its origin in the volcanic ejecta of the Sabatini craters, not of the Alban volcanoes.  What this means I have tried to explain in discussing the sources of the Servian wall in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXII, 181 ff.

---

[1] Cf. Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius* (New York, 1895), pp. 306 ff.

[2] Virgil *Ecl.* vi. 6;  Ovid *Pont.* iv. 13, 23.

[3] The editor of the Forcellini lexicon must have recognized this implication of the context, for, as may be seen in the article quoted above, he has transferred his definition of *Laudicenus* to Σοφοκλεῖς.

The region from which the stele came was Etruscan land until Veii was captured, and it is highly improbable that any Roman would have gone so far afield for a piece of stone no better than that which the native ledges could provide, unless either the Etruscans then possessed Rome, i.e., before 509, or the Romans had gained possession of the country beyond the Cremera, i.e., after 396. Since the antiquity of the writing excludes the latter period, we should date the inscription before 509.

It would appear then that this stele is also a relic of the Etruscan occupation of Rome; and it is interesting to have its evidence that the language of the Romans continued during the occupation to be the native Latin.

TENNEY FRANK

BRYN MAWR, PA.

# BOOK REVIEWS

L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum Liber xii., *Ad Helviam Matrem de Consolatione.* Par CHARLES FAVEZ. Lausanne-Paris: Libr. Payot et Cie., 1918. Pp. lxix+109.

It is cheering to note the appearance of this useful edition of an important Senecan essay, especially at the present time. Its contents will mean more to those exiles of the last half-decade who have suffered and endured; there will be new life in the old words: "nec secunda sapientem evehunt nec adversa demittunt; laboravit enim semper ut in se plurimum poneret, ut a se omne gaudium peteret" (v. 2). One also notes with interest that M. Favez signs his preface at Clarens, the haunt of Rousseau, that Senecan admirer whose first essay reproduced much of the style and many of the ideas of the Roman philosopher.

The text is based almost entirely upon Gertz. The editor deviates only in a few cases, such, for example, as xi. 6, page 64, where he rejects the *faecis* of the Danish scholar for the *luis* of Ellis, which is textually sounder, though it may not keep up so well the metaphor of the preceding *sincerus animus.* M. Favez is also completer in his critical notes than was Mr. Duff in his edition of 1915; but this is natural in an edition devoted wholly to one essay instead of three. *Exsaniari*, page 9, and *lautissimum*, page 43, are cases in point.

The Introduction does not contribute anything especially new, except the passage from Stilpo, quoted by Teles, p. xlviii. There is unnecessary repetition with regard to the *casa Romuli*, pp. lxii and lxiv. The twofold cause of Seneca's exile is attractively set forth, with a lenient interpretation of Seneca's relations with Julia Livilla, based rather upon the two rival court parties of Messalina and Agrippina than upon any clear case against the philosopher. We cannot help feeling that 8 B.C. is a few years too early to place Seneca's birth; and we are disappointed, after an announcement that the *Consolatio* will be thoroughly discussed as a type, to find little more real information than we found in Summers' (1910) foreword to the sixty-third epistle of Seneca, which is a *consolatio* in miniature.

The general commentary, however, is delightfully clear and copious, as indeed is the essay itself, "de tous les ouvrages de Sénèque le mieux composé peut-être." It is not devoted so much to translational helps as to exposition of the argument, the style, and the matter. Rhetorical points, with comparisons from the Elder Seneca, are woven into the notes in harmonious sequence, bringing out the idea that the piece is more of an essay than an address. There

is more of value here than in the Introduction. This is exemplified by M. Favez' note on the second person of *cogitas*, xiii. 3, p. 74, indicating that in certain remarks "il ne s'addresse pas à elle ici, mais à cet adversaire fictif qu'il fait parler au l." *Vicos*, ix. 2, p. 42, is certainly to be interpreted as a "block of houses" rather than as a "street." The notes, for example, to page 14 are a model of penetrating clearness.

To sum up, this makes the *Consolatio ad Helviam* accessible in French as well as in English, a fact which will be of service to a better understanding of an Empire prose artist who has in the past been taken for granted without being sufficiently understood.

<div align="right">RICHARD M. GUMMERE</div>

THE PENN CHARTER SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA

---

*Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone an griechischen Festen.* By
    THEOPHIL KLEE. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1918.

This is the dissertation of a young Swiss scholar published after his death by the piety of friends. Its chief contribution is the first publication of about thirteen pages of inscriptions from Cos which their discoverer, Professor R. Herzog (*Archaeolog. Anzeiger*, 1909, p. 190; 1905–11), turned over to the author to edit. The fragmentary inscriptions are lists of the victors at the Coan Asclepieia, dated *ca.* 250–178 B.C. (p. 18).

Taking these as his text or pretext the author discusses in successive chapters the programs and the order of events, the age classes, the festival dates, and the lists of victors for the four great games of the *periodos*, the seven other games of Pan-Hellenic significance for which we have inscriptions, and several local and minor contests. Without being able to solve finally the many technical problems that still remain in doubt, he re-collects the evidence and weighs the opinions of Förster, Hyde, Juthner, Gardiner, Paton and Hicks, and others. His book will be indispensable to the special student of the subject, and, as Professor Herzog says in his *Nachruf*, it will also be a useful and convenient work of reference for Greek chronology by reason of its lists of dated names.

To the student of Pindar and of Greek literature its chief service is the more vivid realization it brings of the place held in Greek life by these contests and of the minuteness and particularity of their arrangements and classifications. The editors of Pindar comment rarely or slightly on ἀγένειοι (O. 8. 54, 9. 89.), and many students doubtless are left with the impression that it is a mere synonym for "boy" or "youth." It was technical for the class between boy and man, and Klee discusses the recognition or non-recognition

and the age limits of this class at different festivals. When in *Nem.* v. 10 Pindar portrays his hero as οὔπω γένυσι φαίνων τέρειναν ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν the modern reader feels it as merely decorative phrasing. The Greek probably took it technically as an equivalent of ἀγένειος. With the later development of professional athletics and the extension of systematic gymnasial training for boys the part of boys in the games and the significance of precise age limits became more important. The Asclepieia distinguish παῖδες πυθικοι (12–14?), παῖδες ἰσθμικοί (14–17), ἀγένειοι (17–20). The origin and first meaning of the singular designations πυθικοί and ἰσθμικοί Klee is unable to determine. At the Herakleia in Chalcis the classification was παῖδες πάμπαιδες, παῖδες, ἔφηβοι, ἀγένειοι, ἄνδρες (p. 44, *IG*, XII, 9, 952).

PAUL SHOREY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Linguistic Change, an Introduction to the Historical Study of Language.* By E. H. STURTEVANT. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1917. Pp. x+185. Price $1.00 net.

"This little book, which has grown out of lectures to students beginning their scientific study of language, is primarily intended as a textbook for similar introductory courses." As such it will no doubt serve a good purpose, the popularizing of a science of which the average university professor, not to mention the ordinary educated man, is content to know nothing because he already knows enough. A similar book on astronomy or botany could hardly hope to be used in a high school; and yet for most American universities Professor Sturtevant's book is sufficiently advanced to meet its intended use.

Since linguistic knowledge is so rare, however, our author might have been a little more guarded in his statements. It might mislead some to read (p. 29) that "language is a purely conventional affair," or (p. 98) that "etymology is a valuable study, but we should not expect it to help us very much in understanding our mother-tongue."

In a book on "linguistic change" the sound-changes ought to have been more carefully defined. They naturally fall into several classes—three at least should be made: (1) Those that are mainly physiological, dependent upon the limitations of the organs of speech—phonetic laws in their strictest sense. Such would be the effect on each other of contiguous consonants or of consonant and vowel. Such changes are least restricted in time and place. (2) The gradual change of one sound to another, as in OE *hūs;* ME *house,* or Lat. *pater,* ME *father.* However caused, such changes are not

in themselves inevitable and are therefore local and temporary. (3) Sound-substitution, the (usually) sudden change of one sound to another. This may be due to a variety of causes: defective reproduction, analogy, metathesis, dissimilation, non-contiguous assimilation, etc. These three classes could of course be subdivided.

The subtitle to chapter iv, "Semantic Change Erratic," is as untrue as the old idea of phonetic changes. It is equivalent to saying that the human mind does not work logically. Because we cannot show the logical connection between two meanings does not prove the change erratic. In many cases the meanings that survive have come from a common meaning. Such is the case with ME *knave*, NHG *Knabe*. Here the primary meaning was not "boy" but "plug, chunk," as appears from Hess. *knabe* "Stift, Bolze," the diminutive of which is MHG *knebel* "knebel, Knöchel, grober Gesell, Bengel." Such words as *chump, clod, block, plug, stub* are repeatedly used as descriptive terms of persons. For examples see *Modern Philology*, II, 474.

A number of incorrectly explained forms might be noted. One shall suffice. On page 51 it is said: "Metathesis of a vowel and a consonant is seen in Chaucer's *brid* for 'bird,'" which is a reversal of the fact. As any student of OE would know, *brid* is the older form and *bird* the later. Like *bird* are numerous other examples, as *burst, curds, horse, dirt, third*, all of which originally had *r* before the vowel, although in some instances metathesis had already taken place in OE.

However, in spite of a few errors and some (perhaps justifiable) omissions, the book is a welcome addition to a neglected subject. If it appeals to a wider public, as the author hopes, and helps to bring the day when the "wife" shall cease from "weaving" and Carlyle's "king" shall be "canned" (along with all other kings), then health to its navel and marrow to its bones till the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of its ignorance, as the waters cover the sea.

<div align="right">Francis A. Wood</div>

University of Chicago

---

*Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria.* A dissertation presented to the faculty of Princeton University in candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By Gustave Adolphus Harrer. Princeton: University Press, 1915.

This dissertation belongs to the same class of work as Peaks's *The General and Military Administration of Noricum and Raetia* (Chicago doctoral dissertation, 1905) and Stout's *The Governors of Moesia* (Chicago and Prince-

ton), both of which were written under the auspices of Professor F. F. Abbott. It is a useful type of thesis, for it not only furnishes abundance of problems upon which the candidate for the doctorate can whet his wits, but makes a substantial contribution to the store of information in regard to details which is an essential preliminary to that comprehensive history of the administration of the Roman provinces which we hope will some day be written.

Dr. Harrer has done his work well. He has collected carefully the available data bearing on the identity and chronology of the officials who served as governors or procurators of the province, and has subjected his material to a thorough and discriminating scrutiny. When the evidence on a name is inconclusive, he has not hesitated to indicate his doubts, and the number of interrogation marks that adorn the pages of the pamphlet attest the conservative quality of his judgment.

To the lists of governors and procurators he has added sections on "The Separation of Cilicia and Syria," "The Revolt of Pescennius Niger," and "The Division of Syria." There is a note also on *CIL*, III, 6169. These additions partake of the nature of appendixes and, giving to the treatise a more miscellaneous character than is usual in doctoral dissertations, detract somewhat from the unity of the work.

G. J. LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Pagan Ideas of Immortality during the Early Roman Empire.* By CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918.

This is the Ingersoll Lecture for 1918 and so belongs to that series of lectures on immortality which includes William James's *Human Immortality*, Benjamin Ide Wheeler's *Dionysos and Immortality*, Royce's *The Conception of Immortality*, Osler's *Science and Immortality*, and other contributions by well-known hands on different phases of the subject.

Professor Moore begins with the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, that "strange compound of popular belief, philosophy, and theology," and after a brief review of its contents sketches rapidly the origin and history of the theories and beliefs indicated or expounded in it. He touches on the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*, the ideas of the Orphics and Pythagoreans, the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle, and the views of the post-Aristotelian schools. He points out also the hope of immortality immanent in the Eleusinian mysteries, in the cult of Isis, and in the worship of Mithras. Needless to say, the narrow limits of a single lecture have prevented a full discussion of any

of these themes, but the author has succeeded in bringing out in strong relief
the various forms in which the belief in immortality manifested itself in
philosophic systems, cults, and mysteries of widely different origin and
character. Throughout there is a striking dexterity of condensation that
will appeal both to scholar and layman; and everyone who reads the book
will close it with a more vivid realization of the extent to which pagan theories
of immortality prepared the way for Christian doctrine.

G. J. LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

# IN MEMORIAM

## KIRBY FLOWER SMITH

Kirby Flower Smith, Professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University, died very suddenly at his home in Baltimore, December 6, 1918.

He was born at Pawlet, Vermont, December 6, 1862, the son of Henry H. and Julia (Flower) Smith. He graduated at the University of Vermont in 1884. In 1885 he entered the Johns Hopkins University to study Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit under Professors Gildersleeve, Warren, and Bloomfield. He was admitted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1889. He was immediately made an instructor on the Johns Hopkins staff, and in spite of various tempting calls from other institutions, he remained in the service of the University till the day of his death. In 1914–15 he was granted leave of absence to serve as Director of the School of Classical Studies in the American Academy in Rome. He received the honorary degree of LL.D. from the University of Vermont in 1910.

He was a very thorough and exact scholar, and one of the best-read men I ever knew, an interesting and inspiring teacher, and an excellent public lecturer. He was a fair and kindly critic of his students, or of other scholars, always more ready to approve, or improve, than to condemn, always generous of his time, of his own rich store of books, of his own special knowledge. He was the most genial and affable of men, strong, hearty, and true—the kind of man that appeals alike to the scholar and to the man in the street. He was Dr. Gildersleeve's special and peculiar favorite, the nearest and dearest of all his long roll of students, the most closely akin to the master himself.

His published work was very carefully finished, with as much attention paid to form and style as to the matter—the well-considered final kind which leaves little to add and nothing to retract. His edition of the Elegies of Tibullus (1913) would be in itself a stately monument for any classical scholar; and it is a peculiarly fitting

monument for him, for every page of the introduction and commentary is instinct with his own delightful personality.　When he felt it necessary, he could deal with the severest details of technical scholarship—I have no space for titles here—but it is characteristic of the man that most of his studies treat of subjects which make a more direct appeal to the imagination.　He was a careful student of the elegy and of rhetoric; but I think his special interest was always the drama.　He was a very ardent student of folklore and magic, and he never lost his interest in the fairy tale.

He married, in 1893, Charlotte, daughter of Edmund Law Rogers, of Baltimore, and he is survived by his wife, one son, and a daughter.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY